

THE  
SCOTTISH REVIEW.

---

---

JANUARY, 1896.

---

---

ART. I.—THE STATE OF TURKEY.

THE critical condition of the Turkish Empire in Asia may render interesting a short account of the various mixed populations—Moslem, Christian, and Jewish—which are mingled together, in Asia Minor, Syria, and Arabia, under Turkish rule, and of the changes slowly occurring during the last forty years in their relative position. The Armenians especially attract notice for the moment, but the discontent of subject population is not confined to that unfortunate race, or indeed to Christians only.

The Armenians are the only Aryan race ruled by the Sultan with the exception of the scattered Greek population found in the cities of Syria, and forming a strong factor in the West of Asia Minor. Herodotus informs us that the Armenians of his day were Phrygian colonists, and the Phrygians belonged to the European family of the Aryans, and entered Asia Minor from the West. The Armenian language is one of the most interesting of early Aryan tongues, being most nearly connected with the Slav languages. It has become somewhat corrupted by the introduction of Turkish and even of Arabic words, but it is substantially Aryan in grammar and in vocabulary, and its words often throw light on the origin of terms

which would otherwise remain doubtful. Even the term Arya, which has so variously been explained, is perhaps best connected with the Armenian *Ayr* for a man. The two great streams of migration which brought the Aryans into Asia Minor appear to have followed the northern route from the West, and the southern route from the East. In the ninth century B.C., the Medes had advanced from near the Caucasus to the shores of Lake Van, superseding an earlier Mongol population in Matiene; and in the Persian period the Lycian language is more nearly akin to the Iranian tongues than to the European, though strongly influenced already by Greek. The early Phrygian inscriptions appear on the other hand to belong to the European family of Aryan speech. In our own time the Armenians represent the northern immigrants, while the very corrupt Georgian language, traceable back to the Middle Ages, is also Aryan but more probably of Medic origin. The Armenian has however borrowed from the Georgian, and the Georgian from the Armenian.

The early history of the Armenians is to a great extent legendary. Their civilisation (including their alphabet) was, like that of the Georgians, derived from the Greeks of Constantinople, but the controversies of the sixth century resulted in the separation of the Armenian Church from that of Byzantium, and they were, like most of the Oriental Christian Churches, converted to Monophysite belief by Jacob Baradaeus. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Christian kingdom of Armenia became an important bulwark of civilisation, long resisting the attacks not only of the Turkish and Kurdish tribes of Baghdad, but also of the Mongols when advancing on the tottering Frank kingdom of Palestine. In the thirteenth century especially the Norman feudal system became the model of the Armenian State. The 'Assizes of Jerusalem' were then translated into Armenian; the Templars and Hospitallers were given lands and castles in all parts of the kingdom. Some of the Armenian clergy were reconciled to Rome, and founded the still existing though unimportant sect of Armenian Catholics. The kings of Armenia were allied by marriage to the Norman Princes of Antioch, and their armies



joined the Frank forces in opposing the Tartars. Even from the first the Crusader Kings had married Armenian wives, and the power of the Counts of Edessa, who held the highroad from Baghdad by which alone an advance on Syria was possible, was confirmed by the Armenian alliance. To speak of Armenia as only a 'geographical expression' is to ignore its history, and the services of its kings to the cause of civilisation in Western Asia. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the power of the old Seljūk conquerors, who under Melek Shah had ruled from India to the borders of Egypt, and to the gates of Byzantium, was entirely broken down by the Crusaders on the West, and by the Armenians on the East. The Sultans of Iconium, from whom the Osmanli family traces its descent, were then hemmed in by the Greeks on the West, and by the Armenian Christian State on the East. They ruled a very mingled population, and were already themselves of mixed stock, Georgian and Armenian wives being sometimes the mothers of the Turkish heirs. The destruction of civilisation thus painfully built up by European statesmen was not due to any Turkish effort, but resulted from the great wave of Mongol outbreak which swept over Western Asia and Russia. The Turks suffered equally with the Christians from this barbarian invasion. Only when the Egyptians under Bibars and Kelaun had driven the Franks out of Syria, and when the Mongols had laid waste Armenia, did the Turkish power begin to revive; and the Sultans of Iconium inherited the ruins after the Tartar retreat.

The Armenian race in our own times is perhaps not purely Aryan, and like the Kurds—descended from the ancient Parthians—they have no doubt in their veins a strong infusion of Turkish and Mongol blood. In physical type they are among the finest of West Asiatic races—tall and strong, with ruddy faces, but with dark eyes and hair like Mongols. They are reputed to be one of the cleverest races in the Turkish Empire, but they cannot be said to be popular. Their power of acquiring wealth by usury renders them as odious to the peasantry of other stocks as are the Jews, and they are despised by Moslems on account of their drunkenness, which

is a common vice among them, as also among the Oriental Christians. Fanatical hatred has no doubt an important part in the persecution of Armenians, but the grudges of the Moslem peasants have also no doubt been paid on usurers, at a time when the ruling power has become alarmed at the spread of revolutionary ideas among its Christian subjects, and seeks to stamp them out with a barbarity which has always characterised the Turks when their rule is disputed by any subject people, whether Moslem or Christian. The subjugation of Syria, within the present century, was marked by cruelties as ruthless as those of to-day, but directed against the sturdy Moslem peasantry, who fought for liberty during many years in the mountains of Galilee and Samaria.

The present moment recalls to mind the condition of Asia under the Seljuk Turks at the close of the eleventh century, A.D. The Korân not only does not sanction, but its teaching discourages the persecution of Christians, who, according to Muhammad, were nearer to Islam than Jews or Mazdeans. All 'People of a book,' both those who accepted the Gospels, those who revered the Hebrew Scriptures, and those who preserved the Persian Zend-Avesta, were placed in quite a different category from that of the *Kufâr* or Pagans, who belonged to neither of the great religions existing in Muhammad's time. So the *Kâfir* was given the choice of 'the Korân or the Sword,' but Christians were only reduced to tribute; and the Korân precepts were observed alike by the first Arab Khalifs of Damascus, and by the latter Abbaside Khalifs of Baghdad. Harûn-er-Rashîd gave to Charlemagne the keys of Jerusalem, and persecution only began in the eleventh century, when the fanatical and heretical Fatimite Khalif of Egypt seized Jerusalem. Before his time El Mukaddasi speaks of the Syrian Christians as being extremely independent in bearing, and of the Moslems as constantly suffering from Byzantine inroads on the coast cities. The Seljuk Sultans, who protected the last feeble descendants of the great house of Abbas, in Baghdad, having become converts to the Sunnee or more orthodox teaching of Islam, distinguished themselves after the death of Melek Shah by their

persecution of Christians. It was the cruelty of the sons of Ortok in Jerusalem which roused the wrath of all Europe against the Turks, and which led to the first Crusade, just as in our own time the wrath of Europe is roused by Turkish persecution of Christians in the East.

But it must not be forgotten that for nearly a thousand years the Turks have been the ruling race in Asia. Even in Egypt, since the twelfth century, the rulers have never been Arabs, though the population did not include any important Turkish element in any age. The Mongols indeed appear at at the very dawn of history as the dominant people, in Chaldea, in Armenia, in Syria, and in Egypt; and the Semitic races, which ruled Western Asia for fifteen centuries before the Persian Conquest, only again attained independence for four hundred years between the time of Muhammad and of Melek Shah. During the remainder of historic time they have been subject either to Mongols or to Aryans—the Persians, Greeks, Romans and Franks. The great struggle of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries produced not a single conqueror of Arab race, for Saladin was a Kurd, and Bibars was also of Turkish origin. The force of Arab genius seems to have been expended a few centuries after Muhammad, and though it is to the Arabs that we owe the preservation and diffusion of that civilisation, which they learned from Greek, Persian, and Indian subjects, it cannot be said that the Arab race has shewn great ruling qualities, since the decay of the Abbaside power which reached its zenith in the ninth century of our era.

The Turks themselves learned much from Persia and from Greece, through their first relations with subject races in Asia. The Turkish palaces of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Asia Minor, like those erected by the Mongols at Samarkand and elsewhere in Central Asia, are evidence of the influence of Persian architecture on these rude conquering Turanians. The Turks adopted the Arab alphabet, as the Mongols adopted the Syriac of the Nestorians. The modern Turkish dialect of Stamboul is so full of Arab and Persian words, for which there were often no terms in Turkish proper, that only

about a tenth part of the Stambuli vocabulary now traces to pure Turkish brought by the Seljuks from the Oxus. The majority of the ruling class in Turkey is of mongrel origin, and only among the peasantry of Asia Minor is the purer Turkish type to be discovered: for in Europe it is mingled with Slav blood, and in Kurdistan with Persian. But the tradition of a rude and masterful domination survives from the time of Osmanli Conquest, and the Aryan and Semitic subjects of the Sultan possess no tradition of independent self-government. The harsh bondage of four centuries has stamped out the spirit of freedom, among Moslems and Christians alike, unless it is still to be recognised among Armenian rebels.

The power of the Christians in Turkey has, however, steadily increased within the last forty years. The massacres of Damascus led to the establishment of a Christian State in the Lebanon, answering roughly to the old county of Tripoli under the Franks. Protected by the European powers, with a constitution which prevents the Turk from levying arbitrary taxes, and with a Christian police, under a Christian governor elected by the powers, the province of the Lebanon presents to us the one bright spot in an empire filled with cruelty and oppression. When this state was first established by Lord Dufferin, its population was quite as mixed as that of Armenia. The Druze nobles, who dominated the Maronite Christians, answered to the Kurds of Armenia, and the separation of Christian and Moslem presented a problem quite as difficult in appearance of solution. Yet the establishment of this province has been so successful that we have heard no more of any massacres in Syria. The Druzes have gradually and peacefully retired to Hermon and Bashan, and an independent Christian peasantry has prospered so greatly, under just government, that the Lebanon is unable to contain them, and they have gradually overflowed into other parts of Syria, Cyprus, and neighbouring regions. The lesson so learned may surely leave us to suppose that if it were possible to extend to North Syria the same system of government, including the regions round Aleppo and Merash from which the latest news of Armenian massacres now reaches us, we might witness in time a natural

sifting of population, as the Armenians gathered into a new province under Christian rule, in which the fierce Kurds and Turks would find themselves powerless to oppress. Following the example of the Druzes they would no doubt betake themselves to wilder districts.

To expect that any Moslem power will, of its own free-will, place Christians on an equality with Moslems, and divide equally between them the offices of government, is hopeless. It is contrary to the Moslem creed, and no Sultan could dare so to outrage the prejudices of his Moslem supporters. The superior education of Syrian and Armenian Christians has always led to their employment in minor offices, as secretaries and scribes under Turkish governors, just as the Copts in Egypt have long occupied similar positions. But the only instances in which Christian governors have been sanctioned by the Sultans are those in which European compulsion has forced them on the Turk. The establishment of a mixed Christian and Moslem police is as contrary to Turkish ideas as would be the service of Christians in the army. The law of Turkey is theoretically the law of the Korân, interpreted to the governor by the religious Kâdi. The decisions of the Sultan rest on the dicta of the Sheikh el Islâm, and on the inspired utterances of the Derwish orders. The equality of Christian and Moslem is a heresy which, if proclaimed by a Moslem ruler, would probably cost him his throne. The Sultan, whose only support is found in the acceptance by Islam of his claim to be regarded as Khalif, based on his rank as *Hâmi el Haramein* or 'Guardian of the two sanctuaries' of Mecca and Jerusalem, is no free agent in his own dominions, and can yield only to Christians on compulsion. The establishment of village councils under a *Mukhtâr*, which figures as a new reform in the recent edict, is no new feature of administration. The *Mejlis* or council of native Moslem elders—sometimes admitting Christian and Jewish members—already exists in every town or village, but the governing power rests with the ruler who has at his command an irregular mounted police, backed by regular Moslem troops. The more the decree is examined the more will it be found to alter nothing which



already exists. It is not the law of the Korân which entails suffering on Christians, but the spirit in which that law is administered, with a fanatical harshness which has throughout history characterised Turkish rule. That the fanatical spirit of Islam is not yet dead we have already learned to our cost, and may see in recent events at Stambul and in Armenia. Such events must raise throughout the Turkish empire an excitement among Moslems which is one of the gravest and most dangerous features of the situation. Disunited as they are among themselves, and undermined as Islam is in the west by scepticism, there yet remains in the wilder districts a memory of the great age of Moslem conquest, which leads all Moslems to regard the Christian as fit only for slavery.

The Turkish population is confined to its ancient home in Asia Minor, where it maintained its independence even in the days of Frank rule in Armenia and Syria. The Popes sought in vain to convert the Sultans of Iconium, who never proved reliable allies even when siding with Christians against the Egyptians. The larger part of the Sultan's dominions is occupied by the Arab nation, to whom the Turk is a stranger by race and by language. Even in Western Asia Minor the Greek population forms an important element. In Cyprus the Turkish immigrants are confined mostly to the hills, the Greeks and Maronites holding the plains. In the Lebanon and in Palestine, in Mesopotamia and Arabia, the Turk only is found as a government official. Among all the Arab-speaking peoples—Christian or Moslem—he is hated as a foreign oppressor, yet these regions are the very ones which—as Khalif—it is vitally necessary for the Sultans to possess. The loss of Mecca and of Jerusalem means the loss of his only claim to the Khalifate—a dignity which ceased to exist for three centuries, until it was revived and usurped by the Osmanlis, who were not even of the Prophet's race.

The spirit of political intrigue, which has always existed among the Christians of the Turkish Empire, has become yet more prevalent as the result of political events. Once more, as in the twelfth century, the Christian powers of Europe are pressing Eastwards. The Turkish dominion is lopped of its



outlying provinces in Europe and in Africa, and Western civilisation has reached Cyprus, and presses into Palestine. The Christian state in the Lebanon presents a nucleus for the non-Moslem populations in Syria itself. The railway has reached Jerusalem and Damascus, and an invasion of Jews, driven out of Russia, has doubled the non-Moslem population of Jerusalem, and has spread a dozen Jewish agricultural colonies over the Holy Land, even as far east as Bashan. The Christians are still held down by a government supported by Moslem troops, but they watch with intense interest every movement of the European powers, and though bitterly divided among themselves, according to the ancient antagonisms of Greek, Armenian, Syrian, Georgian, and Nestorian Churches, there is no doubt that all alike hope to be finally rescued by European aid. The Arab Moslem population of Syria is meanwhile rendered disaffected to the Turks by long experience of their unjust rule, and the half subjected Bedouin of the deserts, who though nominally Moslems have practically no religion beyond a belief in ancestral ghosts and desert demons, watch as ever their opportunity to raid and pillage Christian and Moslem peasantry alike, whenever the central power shall have become too weak to control them.

In Arabia the Turks have their most difficult task, on account of its remote position and of its desert lands. It was in Arabia that the Turks crushed out the only attempt made to reform Islam by returning to the original teaching of the Korân. The persecution of the Wabâbi sect was perhaps as savage as any persecution of Christians, and the aspirations of the Arabs point to the establishment of an Arab Khalif in the person of the Sherif of Mecca.

With all these elements of discontent, and possible revolt, the Turks have long been familiar. The immediate dissolution of the Turkish empire was expected half a century ago. Yet they have stubbornly held on to their conquests, and have even rendered more complete their subjugation of the various and mingled elements of population whom they rule. We have so far witnessed no general convulsion, but a gradual decay of Turkish power beginning at its furthest frontiers, and

the slow growth of small Christian states, appearing sporadically and gradually becoming independent. The Turks know well how unwilling all European statesman must be to fan the flames of a great conflagration, and how jealously they eye each other whenever the question of dividing up the Sultan's empire is forced to the front by popular misery. An united Europe could no doubt reduce the Sultan to-morrow to his original position as Turkish ruler of Iconium, were it not for the question who is then to be ruler in Stambul, in Mecca, in Syria, and at Baghdad, or in Armenia? Until such thorny questions are settled, by agreement or by accident, the Sultan no doubt intends to rule his people according to the ancient Turkish policy of repression and extortion.

The danger of a revolt of the army is the greatest that lies before the Turk. As Moslems they can be relied on against Christians, but as human beings there must be a limit to their powers of enduring a condition in which they are not only deprived of pay, and unable to earn money for themselves, but even deprived of food, and sometimes on the verge of starvation. A ruler who is unable to feed, or to pay for the transport of his troops, stands in great danger of a military revolt—especially among Syrian, Albanian, and other regiments of non-Turks. The Turkish army has proved its fighting powers not long since, in spite of treachery and incompetence among some of its leaders, but while the greater part of the force must be kept locked up in Europe, on the north-west frontier of the empire, the presence of troops is urgently needed in Armenia and in Arabia, and the most pressing question is how they can be spared, and how they can be sent to such remote districts.

Among the subject Christians the Armenians alone have so far found courage in despair, in their attempt to win freedom from an intolerable double tyranny—of Kurdish chiefs and Turkish Pashas; but if success were in the end to crown their efforts the Armenians would not stand alone. The Christians of North Syria—Greek or Syrian in creed—have many grievances of their own. The more fortunate Maronites of the Lebanon province, who have a Christian police, and who are

keen politicians, might become inoculated with the idea of independence. The flame of fanaticism once lit would not distinguish Greek and Armenian Christians. Any success against the Turks in Armenia would lead to insurrection in other provinces.

Amid so many dangers the danger of Moslem disaffection must seem greatest to a Moslem ruler, convinced that the European powers are most unwilling to proceed to extremities. The attention of Russia is turned to the far East, and no power but England is really earnest in the Armenian cause, this earnestness being confined perhaps mainly to religious circles and to liberal politicians. The real rulers of Turkey are not those ministers who are moved as pawns in the game, but the secret Derwish orders on whom the Sultan relies. They form powerful organisations bitterly opposed to all Western ideas, and perfectly informed, through their lower initiates, of all that goes on in the various provinces of the empire. The realities of government in Turkey are very different from its diplomatic exterior appearances; and the Khalif dominates the Sultan.

It may be that the Turks will once more assert their old predominance over their subjects, since their successor has not yet appeared. The Armenians are destined either to work out their own future or to perish in the attempt. It is practically impossible for Europe to interfere, unless Europe is ready to undertake the administration of new provinces in Asia. The subject populations are so much split up, and have so long been unaccustomed to rule themselves, that nothing but anarchy can be expected if the Turkish administration is overthrown. The happiest outcome that could be expected would be the creation of a new Christian province in North Syria or in Armenia, where the oppressed might find refuge, and learn by degrees to rule themselves, until fit for independent existence as a Christian state.

C. R. CONDER.

---

## ART. II.—JOHN STUART BLACKIE.

*John Stuart Blackie: a Biography.* By ANNA M. STODDART.  
2 vols. Edinburgh. 1895.

TWO hundred years have elapsed since Dr. Pitcairn, in his famous epitaph on Viscount Dundee, addressed that departed hero as *Ultime Scotorum!* and since that period patriotic North Britons have been continually discovering warriors, statesmen, and poets more worthy of the epithet of 'last of Scots' than was John Grahame of Claverhouse. The great Duke of Argyll and Greenwich, victor at Sheriffmuir, has been so described; George Dempster of Dunnichen was also thought worthy of the title; and when Sir Walter Scott died the phrase was frequently applied to him. This curious fashion has been recently revived, and since the death of John Stuart Blackie, in March of last year, he has been mourned and lamented in this strain, as though the race of Scotsmen had terminated with his existence. Overstrained homage of this kind would have been repulsive to Blackie himself. It was not his ambition to be the 'last of Scots, and last of freemen,' but rather to hand on to coming generations the tradition of sturdy patriotism which he had received, and to keep alive that love of Scotland and all things Scottish which had glowed for so many years in his own breast. It is impossible, so soon after his death, to forecast the verdict which posterity will pass upon him; but even now it will not be unprofitable to examine the claims which he has upon the affectionate remembrance of his countrymen. In one respect Blackie has been peculiarly fortunate. His biographer had special facilities for knowing her hero in all his moods, and the picture which Miss Stoddart has drawn with a loving hand avoids equally the extremes of overpraise and of unjust depreciation. She is far from attempting to delineate Blackie as a faultless hero, and yet she is so kind to his errors, so tender to his eccentricities, that the reader is compelled to conclude that 'even his failings leaned to virtue's side.' And this, when all is said, is the true method of treating such a complex character as his. The

time would inevitably have come when Blackie's personality would have faded into a dim outline, and Scotsmen, considering his literary works alone, might have wondered that his influence was so widely spread, and so evocative of enthusiasm; but with this admirable biography before them they will be able in some measure to understand his place in our era, and to apportion his due share of renown.

John Stuart Blackie was born in a mansion in Charlotte Street, Glasgow, on 28th July, 1809. His father was a banker in that city, and had taken up house there when he was married; but at the close of the year of his eldest son's birth, Alexander Blackie received an appointment as Agent for the Commercial Bank in Aberdeen, and thither the future Professor was transferred. No Scotsman is worthy of consideration unless he can boast of 'a lang pedigree,' and it would have been a peculiar misfortune to Blackie had he been unable to trace his ancestry. Miss Stoddart supplies ample material in the biography for those psychologists who manufacture air-spun theories on the subject of heredity. From her account of Blackie's genealogy it is evident that he was a very composite entity. He was derived paternally from 'a stock of solid Borderers,' who had been settled on Tweedside near Kelso for several generations. His great-grandfather was the proprietor of a little strip of ground in this locality, and married the daughter of a neighbouring farmer. The eldest son of this marriage became a wine-merchant in Kelso, and his bride brought a strain of Celtic blood into the Blackie family. There was then a certain Dr. Stuart in Kelso who claimed descent from the race of Scottish Kings, and whose ancestors for many generations had practised medicine, and had acknowledged pronounced Jacobite proclivities. There was some relationship between the Blackies and the Stuarts which sanctioned social intercourse; and the young wine-merchant fell in love with Alison Stuart, his cousin several times removed. Dr. Stuart had other views for the settlement of his only daughter, and sternly forbade the proposed marriage. But in such circumstances 'love will find out the way,' and the youthful couple made a runaway match. Blackie did not survive long,

and left his widow with a son and daughter sparingly provided for. The old doctor was dead, but his son and successor, Dr. Archibald Stuart, received his widowed sister and her two children, into his home, and made their welfare his special care. Alexander Blackie was trained for a mercantile career, and having entered the Commercial Banks he ultimately became Agent, first in Glasgow and afterwards in Aberdeen. He was the father of John Stuart Blackie.

Quite another element in the character of the late Professor was introduced from the maternal side. His mother was Helen Stodart, daughter of William Stodart, an architect of some renown, who resided at Hamilton. She was the scion of an old Border family from Selkirkshire that had settled in the Upper Ward of Lanarkshire about the middle of last century, while on the mother's side she could claim descent from the famous Covenanting family the Naismiths, whose deeds were memorable during 'the killing time.' Helen Stodart met Alexander Blackie occasionally at the house of a mutual friend, and in the end a match was made, and the young couple took up their residence in Charlotte Street, Glasgow, where John, their second child, was born. Looking back over the details of the mixed ancestry from which he was derived, one might account for several of John Stuart Blackie's peculiarities on the plea of heredity. He was a loyal Jacobite, as became a descendant of the Stuarts; yet he was also a sturdy Covenanter, as one who had to maintain the honour of the name of Naismith. It was equally easy for him to speak enthusiastically of the martial achievements of Bonnie Prince Charlie and his kilted heroes, or to immortalize in verse the dubious story of Jenny Geddes and her stool. In short, his was a many-sided patriotism that could reverence the King while it honoured the people; and whether he owed this disposition to heredity or not, it was one of the most potent causes of his popularity.

Neither to the Border country of his ancestors, nor to the city of his birth did Blackie owe the development of his character. It was in Aberdeen that his early years were spent; in the Granite City he received the elements of his education; and in Marischal College he first blossomed out as a Professor,



and laid the foundations of that scholastic reputation which was completed in Edinburgh. Hence it is only natural that the Aberdonians should claim him as 'a toun's bairn,' and share in the reflected glory of his name. Though not by any means a dull boy, he was so impatient of restraint of any kind that he refused to submit to the drudgery of learning the alphabet, not recognising that it was the key by which alone the treasures of past wisdom could be reached. Thus early did he show that intense love of freedom, of liberty of thought and of speech, which, in his later life, often brought him into difficulties. If any task were laid upon him as a duty, the necessity of its execution made it repulsive to him; and though he would faithfully perform the work, he chafed inwardly at the limitation of his free-will. Equally restive was he under the imposition of the metaphorical fetters of a creed; and he loudly resented even the appearance of compulsion. But, on the other hand, the most stupendous work—such as the translation of *Æschylus*, or the foundation of the Celtic Chair at Edinburgh University—did not appal him, when once he had taken it up voluntarily. There was nothing of the sluggard about Blackie, though task-work was abhorrent to him. He would throw himself with perfervid energy into any work, however arduous, provided he were allowed to do it 'whan it cam' up his ain back,' as they say in Scotland. This independence of spirit which began with his opposition to the alphabet, ruled the whole of his life and shaped his career.

Blackie was very fortunate in his first teacher. A new Academy had been founded in Aberdeen and placed under the charge of Peter Merson, a classical student who had attained some distinction at Marischal College. Merson was not only an excellent Latinist, but also an intelligent student of mankind, and he soon took the measure of his young scholar. He saw that Blackie must be wiled into the thorny paths of literature, not driven against his will, and the method he adopted was so successful that the boy left the Academy a fairly good Latin scholar, and one who had learned the art of self-dependence. The spirit of emulation had been awakened within him, and he could not tolerate an inferior place, even

though he gained a high position by irksome labour. Long years afterwards the Professor wrote thus of his schoolboy days:—

‘I got my lessons carefully, but I cannot say that this proceeded from any particular love either of books or lessons. I imagine it was merely from the natural energy of my character, with an ambitious impulse that did not like to be last, when there was a fair chance of being first. I was put into a little world—the school—where action was the law, and it was contrary to my nature to be lazy or to be last. I was called upon to act for honour and glory with my equals, and I did my best with decision. That was the whole secret of my school activity.’

At Marischal College Blackie matriculated in 1821, having gained a small bursary when he entered, which he resigned to a poorer student. His three years’ course was not specially distinguished, the most noteworthy circumstance being that the study which proved most attractive to him was Natural Philosophy, chiefly because Professor Knight could make the subject interesting. His father decided that he should be bred to the law as a profession, and in 1824 he began his apprenticeship. This had not been Blackie’s own choice, and consequently he was not enthusiastic at the prospect of becoming a lawyer, nevertheless, he addressed himself to his studies with industry. A startling circumstance interrupted his course. The sudden death of an acquaintance—a young advocate, brimful of health and vivacity, whom he had met in his father’s house—gave him a shock even more severe than that which he had experienced when his mother died. The serious side of his character, hitherto dormant, was rudely awakened. The strain of Covenanting blood in his nature asserted itself. He renounced the vanities of Shakespeare, Burns, and Scott, that had been his chief delight, and turned with characteristic earnestness to the study of the sterner works of the old divines. Such a crisis is not unusual in one of Blackie’s temperament, especially when he has not had any definite religious instruction, and it nearly always drives the youth from the extreme of indifference to the opposite limit of unbending Calvinism. For him there is no medium between the ‘everlasting Yea,’ and the ‘everlasting No.’ The period forms one

of those turning points in life which settles the career for good or evil. It may be merely a passing phase which will serve as a corrective to youthful frivolity and thoughtlessness, or it may end in theological mania. In Blackie's case this accession of religious melancholy seemed likely to overturn all the arrangements for his prospective career. The study of the law became hateful to him. It dealt only with mundane and transitory affairs, while the problem of eternity confronted him everywhere. An inward voice called persistently upon him to give up concern for the fleeting occupations of this world, and to consecrate his life to religion. His father consented to the proposal that he should proceed to Edinburgh University to complete his Arts course and then enter upon the study of Divinity.

The year he spent in Edinburgh under Professor John Wilson and Dr. Ritchie was not greatly distinguished in an academical sense. His serious convictions interfered with his studies, and he spent much of his leisure time in charitable work in the closes and wynds of Edinburgh, and devoted himself to the study of ultra-Calvinistic books. Even the words of commendation bestowed by Professor Wilson upon his one successful essay only gave him a reason for mortifying the flesh and restraining vanity, with the result that he never submitted another essay like it. He returned to study Divinity at Aberdeen University, under Principal Brown and Dr. Duncan Mearns. By this time his religious fervour had begun to wane, and the cold Moderatism that prevailed in Aberdeen had a chilling effect upon him. A casual word from Dr. Patrick Forbes, Professor of Humanity and Chemistry at King's College, made him lose his faith in formulated theology. Dr. Forbes advised him to study the Greek Testament at first hand, for himself, and to evolve his own theological convictions from it:—

'There was [he says] both sense and gospel here. I immediately flung aside my "Body of Divinity," and forthwith got my Greek Testament interleaved, and commenced a course of Scripture study without the slightest reference to the Westminster Confession or any other systematised essay of Christian doctrine.'

This resolution, however sensible, was not worldly-wise; nor was it so likely to lead to ecclesiastical preferment as the swallowing of conscientious scruples might have done. It is related that when a Divinity student told his Professor that he could not believe a certain doctrine, the astute theologian replied, 'You must *preach* it till you believe it.' Blackie was not made of this flexible material. There was within him that 'stalk o' carle-hemp' of which the poet speaks, that would not permit him to do reverence to the opinions of others not more inspired than himself; and there was also that confidence in his own conclusions that would have made him blurt out an inconvenient truth, even in the pulpit. In view of his after life, one may safely say that he never would have made a successful minister. By the members of his flock he would have been held in high esteem, and they might have listened earnestly to his fervent and eloquent heart-utterances; but his bold explanations of 'essentials' of doctrine, and his derisive sarcasms upon formal 'non-essentials,' would have led him into constant and vexatious bickerings with Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, and these would have ruined his peace of mind.

As Blackie's Divinity course neared its conclusion a serious problem confronted Blackie, Senr. What was to be made of this gifted son of his,—this bundle of opinions, prejudices, and miscellaneous knowledge? He would have nothing to do with Law. The Church had lost its attractions since he found the entrance-porch barred by Creeds, Confessions, and Articles to which he could not wholly and conscientiously subscribe. His tastes had not inclined him to the study of Medicine, and perhaps he would have been too candid and outspoken to succeed in that profession. In his difficulty Mr. Blackie applied to Dr. Forbes, and that very sensible man advised an educational visit to Germany, where his own two sons were to complete their studies. And thus it came about very simply that the unformed entity called John Stuart Blackie was pitchforked into the centre of Europe, that he might see men and cities, and have the abnormal corners rubbed off, and the polish given to him which only travel can impart.

It is unnecessary to detail here the incidents of Blackie's *Wanderjahre* from April, 1829, till his return home at the close of 1831. Suffice it to say that he studied for a short time at the University of Göttingen, where the two Forbes youths remained while he went on to Berlin. His first impressions of German University life were very favourable indeed; and he wrote home to express his delight with German Professors, German students, German social ways, and all things Teutonic. Many a time in after life must George Canning's burlesque lines have occurred to him as he remembered those happy days:—

' Whene'er with haggard eyes I view  
This dungeon that I'm rotting in,  
I think of those companions true  
Who studied with me at the U-  
Niversity of Göttingen.

This faded form! this pallid hue!  
This blood my veins is clotting in;  
My years are many—they were few—  
When first I entered at the U-  
Niversity of Göttingen.'

The Professors under whom he studied at this famous University were Heeren, Saalfeld, Blumenbach, and Ottfried Müller. The methods of instruction pursued were so different from those prevalent at Aberdeen, that Blackie was heartily ashamed of the low standard that existed in Scotland. He wrote thus, after a two months' residence:—

' With reference to our Scottish system of education, the scales fell from my eyes. I perceived that at Marischal College they had degraded the University pretty much into a school; that they drilled boys when they ought to have been stimulating young men; that our academical system was prominently puerile, and our standard of attainment lamentably low. I burned with indignation when I thought of these things, and from that moment became a University reformer.'

At Berlin it was Blackie's good fortune to meet with Schleiermacher, Neander, Raumer the historian, and Boeckh the philologist, and the influence they had upon the receptive mind of the young Scottish student was very pronounced.

His position was an odd one. He was on an educational tour, with no distinct purpose in view save the acquisition of knowledge, and with only a faint possibility that in the remote future he might become a Scottish clergyman. It was the custom long ago to send the sons of Scottish noblemen to the Continent that they might 'finish their education' at some of the famed Universities in Germany or Italy; but it was not usual in the first quarter of this century for students like Blackie to roam from one great seat of learning to another, merely to have their ideas extended. Yet the very freedom he enjoyed made him labour more assiduously than he would have done had a distinct goal been placed before him. His experience of education in Germany effectually took the conceit out of him so far as pride in the Scottish University system was concerned. The results of his student life in Germany were thus summed up by himself years afterwards:—

'At the conclusion of the winter session in Berlin I found myself perfectly master of the German language, thoughtfully read in some of the best German classics, and learning to speculate slowly and thoughtfully under some of the best German influences. But there was a want of speciality about me. I was neither a theologian nor a philosopher, a philologist, nor a poet—just a young man on his travels learning to live, and to feel, and to think, with theological tendencies and a possible theological destiny. I left Germany with a warm side towards the German people, which I have retained through life. Their simplicity, truthfulness, and unaffected naturalness; their thoughtfulness, honesty of research, accuracy of learning, and breadth of generalisation; their kindness, frankness, and true-heartedness were just the sort of virtues that had a peculiar attraction for me. I was glad to learn from them.'

This remarkable tour, which might be called Blackie's 'Sentimental Journey,' was extended into Italy. At Rome he was hospitably received by Chevalier Bunsen, and he studied antiquities under Professor Gerhard, writing an archæological essay in Italian, which was printed in the *Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archæologica per l' anno, 1831*, and attracted some notice at the time. He had the notion of visiting Greece, but his father, thinking, probably, that it was full time for his erratic son to settle down to some definite profession, sternly ordered him home, and he reluctantly made his way back to



London, and thence to Aberdeen. The lingering desire to enter the Church which he had entertained when he started on his tour, had been thoroughly put to flight by his German experiences. Even the Law was less abhorrent to him as a profession, and he soon decided to remove to Edinburgh, and begin his studies for the Scottish Bar. By dint of sheer determination Blackie passed his examination and became a full-fledged Advocate in July, 1834. But in the course of his legal studies he had not neglected literature. His first important work was his translation of Goethe's *Faust*, for which task his recent journey had prepared him.

As the first fruits of his literary genius Blackie's version of *Faust* merits special notice. At the time of its appearance—February, 1834—German literature was comparatively unknown in this country. Coleridge had brought Schiller into notice by his masterly translations of the 'Piccolomini' and 'The Death of Wallenstein.' Sir Walter Scott had published Burger's famous ballad, and had made a barely creditable version of 'Goetz von Berlichingen.' Carlyle had done much to bring German literature within the knowledge of the average reading Briton, both by his translations, and by his 'Life of Schiller.' But the only important work upon which English translators had made repeated assaults was Goethe's 'Faust,' and Blackie could hardly have chosen another poem in the whole range of Teutonic literature that would have submitted him so fully to odious comparisons. The version by Lord Francis Leveson Gower (afterwards Earl of Ellesmere) was considered the most musical; the unrhymed translation by Abraham Hayward was reckoned the most faithful to the original text. Mr. David Syme's version, which came out shortly before Blackie's, was thought sufficiently good to merit kindly mention; and as these were all recent enough to be remembered by the public, for a new writer to dash into the same subject was to challenge inevitable comparison or contrast. Yet Blackie did not take up the work unwarned. Miss Stoddart tells us that 'Sir William Hamilton, Professor Wilson, and the poet "Delta" took helpful interest in the work,' and Blackie had the advantage of revising his translation and com-

paring it with those of his predecessors. If his renown depended upon this work we might hesitate to say a word in depreciation of it; but as it forms only one leaf in his *eichenkranz* it may freely be said that the version was far from satisfactory. On this subject Miss Stoddart's statement is rather misleading. She quotes a letter from Carlyle in which the writer, with Carlylean grimness, suggests a better translation for an unimportant phrase, as though that were the only fault to be found in a work bristling with violent attacks upon the text of Goethe. Read between the lines (as all Carlyle letters should be) this is a sardonic sneer at Blackie, of which the victim was blissfully unconscious. The biographer also says that while Sir Theodore Martin's version superseded Blackie's, the latter was always esteemed the best by George Henry Lewes, and was used in his 'Life of Goethe.' This is either a slip or a disingenuous remark. As Lewes published his biography in 1855 and Sir Theodore's *Faust* appeared ten years later, of course the latter was not available for quotation. As a matter of fact, Blackie's translation was very severely handled by the leading literary journals, and justly so. In his preface Blackie laid down the strange principle that the excellence of a poetical translation depends not on a mere *transposing* but a *recasting* of the original. We shall see later how he was called in question for this very principle by Professor Conington in his review of Blackie's *Æschylus*. It was certainly a very daring thing for a young rhymster like Blackie to attempt a translation of *Faust* at all—a work which even Coleridge, despite his Teutonic sympathies, shrank from, and declined to undertake. Miss Stoddart is not justified in leading the reader to imagine that Blackie's version was hailed with applause by the critics. The *Quarterly Review* (Vol. LII., p. 20), referring generally to translations of *Faust*, has the following passage:—

'Two translations in verse lately published, by Mr. Blackie and Mr. Syme, are creditable in some respects to these enthusiastic, and, we presume, very young admirers of Goethe; but their versification, especially Mr. Blackie's, is deformed throughout by provincial licenses; and neither of them has caught the spirit of the poet in his lyrical snatches.'

Even more pointed and destructive was the criticism upon Hayward's second edition of *Faust*, and Syme's version, published by Messrs. A. & C. Black, and Blackie's version, issued by Messrs. Blackwood, which appeared in the *Athenæum* for 5th July, 1834. The writer, after animadverting upon Hayward's prose, proceeds thus to notice the two new translators:

'We have said that justice cannot be done to *Faust* in English prose; and the translations of Mr. Blackie and Mr. Syme have each failed, in our judgment, to catch Goethe's mantle in poetry. . . . Both of these translators in verse confess, in their prefaces, to minor changes of words, and omissions here and there, to give increased poetical power to the whole! We reprobate all such irreverent tampering. It would never have been dreamed of by anyone who *could* feel and translate Goethe. It has been remarked before, that much of the charm of Goethe's numbers lies in their exquisite unity with the thoughts they breathe. This beauty our translators could not imitate and have not preserved. We have no space now to dwell upon minor points, either of individual merit or failure, nor to attempt any decision, which of these versions sins the most; but must sum the whole up by honestly telling our readers that, as living impressions of Goethe's poetry, both deserve to be put out of court at once.'

The anonymous writer of this review gave ample evidence in previous *Athenæum* articles of his competence as a critic of translations from Goethe. His was not that preference for Byron which Miss Stoddart suggests as the reason for unfriendly criticisms of Blackie's *Faust*. The simple fact is—and it is important to remember this when estimating Blackie's character—that throughout all his life Blackie was the victim of moods which carried him, for the time, into extremes of thought, speech, and action; and at this time he was suffering from an ultra-Germanic attack, hence his intrusion of Teutonized words into his translation, which were neither good English nor passable German. He was at the period *Germanissimus Germanorum*, just as in later days he was *Scotissimus Scotorum*. That he was quite conscious of this mental peculiarity is proved by a letter which he wrote to his sister while he was in Italy:—

'You see I am verse-mad. But you know I am subject to various kinds of madness, and of frequent recurrence. In Aberdeen I got religious-mad; then I got Latin-mad; now I am verse-mad and drawing-mad, and

am getting fast antiquity-mad. Out of this never-ending fermentation may something good arise, that I may not be eternally driven about by every wind of doctrine.'

It was, perhaps, a touch of disappointment at the reception accorded by eminent scholars to his *Faust* that prompted Blackie to abandon Goethe for Wordsworth, a change only to be accounted for on this theory of his mental habit of flying from one poie to its opposite. To exchange the living, active, energetic poetry of Goethe, a man of the world and student of mankind, for that of a dreamy, introspective lover of Nature and solitude like Wordsworth, was too violent a reversal even for Blackie; and he never became an enthusiastic Laker. In the literary society of Edinburgh he took his part with credit. He could write a good song, and sing it well if need be; he could crack a joke of his own, or laugh with Carlylean intensity at the humour of another; he was ever ready to join heartily either in the wit or wisdom of his associates; in short, he was that somewhat rare entity, an excellent 'clubable' man, and his popularity was great accordingly. But he did not succeed at the Bar. During the five years that followed his accession to the dignity of Advocate he held only two briefs, and he was forced to eke out his income by writing articles (chiefly on German subjects) for *Blackwood's Magazine*, and for the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. Meanwhile his study of Greek was sedulously pursued, and so early as 1838 he had begun the translation of *Æschylus*, which was not published till 1850. He did not neglect Law for Literature; but when he could not find clients in the one profession, he was forced to seek patrons in the other.

This briefless barrister, whose only means of support consisted in the uncertain revenue derived from occasional magazine articles, had the hardihood to fall in love with his cousin, Eliza Wyld, and to pay respectful court to her. It could hardly be expected that the young lady's parents would consent to her union with one who, though ten years her senior, had no settled income nor immediate prospects, and the lovers were forced for a time to part. But Fortune, ever kind to those who do not court her favour, was about to turn a smiling

face towards him. Marischal College was then in the throes of a reorganization, and Alexander Bannerman, M.P. for Aberdeen, had not only persuaded Sir Robert Peel's Commission to recommend the foundation of a Latin Chair, but had secured that he should be consulted before any appointment was made to it. Having been himself a banker, Mr. Bannerman was an old friend of the Blackie family, and had kept up correspondence with John Stuart Blackie during all the devious career of that talented young man. He took up Blackie as his candidate, and as splendid testimonials were forthcoming from Sir William Hamilton, Professor Gerhard, and many other men of weight, Blackie was appointed as Regius Professor of Humanity at Marischal College in May, 1839. A curious fence barred his entrance to the office. It was necessary that he should sign the Confession of Faith in the presence of the Presbytery of Aberdeen. To one who had left hide-bound theology so far behind him, this was a severe trial. Many Professors, doubtless, had signed the Confession with mental reservations; few would have had the courage of a Galileo or a Blackie to sign and then pronounce dissent. Silence in such a case would have been golden, but Blackie was too conscientious and outspoken to lurk under a subterfuge. The Presbytery could not ignore his statement, nor could they legally admit him,—at least they were unwilling to take the responsibility of doing so. A protracted litigation ensued, and two years elapsed before he was permitted, after a judgment pronounced by the Court of Session, to enter upon the duties of the professoriate. In the interim he continued his magazine articles, and opened up a correspondence with Eliza Wyld. Her parents prohibited his proposals, and it was not until he had been installed as Professor, and had made a brilliant opening to a distinguished academical career that he won his beloved and wedded her.

There is profound wisdom in the French proverb *Tout vient à point à qui sait attendre*. After all these years of weary waiting, of futile striving to adjust himself to his environment, Blackie had come almost accidentally into the position which he was best fitted to occupy. He was a radical reformer of

Scottish University systems, and he had been placed in a new Chair, untrammelled by tradition, that he might make what he pleased of it. Formalism, pedantry, reverence for the past merely *because* it was past, were all abhorrent to him. He flung these aside, and started his class with a *schwing* and fervour that soon made it a centre of attraction in Marischal College. One of his old pupils, J. Forbes White, LL.D., now of Dundee, thus describes the method pursued by Blackie in conducting his class :—

‘By his good nature and by his cutting wit he soon mastered the turbulent element, and by my year, ’43-44, an easy, natural good behaviour was the rule. He was loved, and this love got him respect. He was, of course, fond of jokes and of extreme statements which caused a laugh, but the class went on sweetly and merrily, busily at work, perfectly under control,—a class entirely different from any other in the ease of its manners.’

Begun in this fashion, and pursued despite the protests and sarcasms of scholastic pedants, Blackie's class became a model. His students were his personal friends; their studies were made lightsome by his hearty commendation or tender correction; and he wiled them into love of literature, when sterner methods would have failed. It is not necessary to dwell upon this period of his life. The most notable action during his ten years at Marischal College was the strong agitation which he got up for the abolition of University tests,—a movement which ultimately resulted in triumph for the progressive party. The period was memorable also because it saw the completion of his translation of *Æschylus*,—a work upon which his reputation with posterity will rest much more than this generation seems to recognise.

Some fatal faculty, like a prematurely tormenting demon, seemed to drive Blackie to the choice of works for translation that presented almost insuperable difficulties. It was so with Goethe's *Faust*, as we have seen, and in a far greater degree with *Æschylus*: but in the latter case he had not to contend with numerous translators, nor to submit to depreciatory comparisons. Save Robert Potter, the learned Vicar of Lowestoft, there had been no metrical English translator of the complete



works of Æschylus until Blackie attempted the task; and as Potter's version had been published in 1777, it was antiquated enough to be considered out of date. Here was practically a fresh field for one who had studied Greek as a living language, and who regarded Æschylus much in the same way as a non-classical reader looks upon Shakespeare. The work had been begun in 1838, and though it was only pursued at intervals, it had never been far from his thoughts during twelve years. The subject was surrounded with dangers. The translator had first of all to settle the rhythmic form which he should adopt. He had to decide whether it would be better to give a line-for-line version, with the added fetters of rhyme, or to cast his version into the shape that an English poet would have chosen to express the ideas. The former plan could not be absolutely carried out; and the latter would probably deteriorate into a mere paraphrastic version, as far removed from the original as Pope's translations are from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Blackie determined to combine the two; to adhere literally to the Greek whenever he could find apt English equivalents, but to reserve the right of digression and paraphrase when the difficulty of the text made that method convenient. He thus followed a modified application of the intolerable principle laid down in his Preface to *Faust*, that the translator should *recast* the thought of the poet. This is not translation but transformation, and it is well for Blackie's reputation that he did not apply his principle completely to Æschylus. Another difficulty was the corruption of the Greek text, which involved prolonged investigations and collation of various versions; labour which is not understood by the non-classical reader, and for which the translator does not receive due credit. It was here that Blackie showed his power in a very unexpected manner. His Prolegomena and notes are of great value to the student, and display sound scholarship and patient investigation such as one would hardly have anticipated from him. It is true that Blackie was neither a Bentley nor a Porson; yet it would not be easy in the present day, to find a Greek scholar even at Oxford who would tackle a complete translation of Æschylus as Blackie did, and bring it to so

triumphant a conclusion. In the very sympathetic review of Blackie's work which Professor Conington wrote for the *Edinburgh Review*, he says:—'A man who girds himself to so arduous a task is no more to be compared with a translator of a single play, than the latter is to be measured against a holiday performer, who, in a happy moment, hits off a solitary chorus.' There was, no doubt, a special attraction for Blackie in the loftiness and sublimity of *Æschylus*. He felt what De Quincey has described as that 'sympathy with the grandeurs of nature and human nature' which the Greek dramatist displayed, and enthusiastically prepared to interpret these for readers of English. His labours were crowned with success. Nothing he accomplished, before this time or after it, is to be compared to this work. He may be remembered as a writer of ephemeral verses by some, as the founder of the Celtic Chair by others; but for posterity he will occupy a unique position as the best English rhythmic translator of the complete works of *Æschylus*.

The publication of Blackie's *Æschylus* had an important effect upon his academical career. It had placed him amongst the foremost Greek scholars of his nation, and when the Greek Chair at Edinburgh University became vacant through the death of Professor Dunbar on 7th December, 1851, Blackie's friends in the Scottish metropolis turned their eyes towards him as one who would make a worthy successor. The presentation to this Chair lay with the Town Council of Edinburgh, and Blackie's claims were so strongly urged that eventually he was appointed to the post, and entered upon his duties at the beginning of the session of 1852-53. This was a position which he had long desired, and again patient waiting had brought the prize within his grasp. When his first session was ended he set out on a visit to Greece, determined to find out for himself how far Greek was still a living language. The conclusions he arrived at ruled all his later opinions, and until the close of his long life he strongly advocated the teaching of Greek as a living mode of expression, not merely as a fossilized form of literature. He had founded the Hellenic Society in Aberdeen amongst his own students for the purpose of keeping

alive the love of Greek literature; and a similar society called the 'Blackie Brotherhood' soon sprang up in Edinburgh. The energetic Professor did not limit his energies to the class-room. Everywhere and at all times he was earnest in his endeavours to spread the love of learning for its own sake amongst his fellow-men.

Blackie had been frequently urged to turn his attention rather to original poetry than to translations, as he had sufficiently shown his power as a versifier in the rhymed passages of his versions of German and Greek poetry. Persuaded by the pertinacity of his friends, he published his first volume of poems in 1857, entitled *Lays and Legends of Ancient Greece*, to which a series called 'Braemar Ballads' was appended. This volume did not greatly help his literary reputation. The plain fact is—and it may as well be said firmly—that Blackie was not a great original poet. There was a certain marching music about his verses, as though they had been improvised to the tread of his own martial stride, and he had also a 'fowth o' rhymes' at his command; yet his poems were lacking in either that concentrated fervour or that highly refined polish which ought to mark the work of a successful and popular poet. Even in his later days, when some passing event incited him to send a sonnet, or a poem that defied classification, to the *Scotsman*, it was painfully evident that he was not even a passable rhymster. Crude, unformed, rugged lines were strung together by him and pitchforked at the public, as though anything that bore the name of Blackie was good enough for the 'Boeotian herd.' It is a notable fact that great translators (with few exceptions) have never been great original poets; and Blackie was no exception. His *Lyrical Poems*, published in December, 1859, is a volume containing a curious medley of songs of love and battle, of past and present times, out of which a limited number of memorable pieces may be selected, but which do not rise very high above mediocrity. The *Lays of the Highlands and Islands*, published in August, 1871, were more appreciated because of the graphic descriptions of Hebridean scenery which they gave; and his *Songs of Religion and Life*, issued in January, 1876, were re-

ceived with applause rather for the devout spirit they displayed than for any special grace of diction. The *Messis Vitæ*, published in October, 1886, was his last volume of poetry, and though it contains several poems that are deeply impressive, as the outcome of an extended experience of life, many of the pieces are not of high merit.

The life of a Professor in a Scottish University, however full it may be of earnest and valuable class-work, is seldom eventful. It is unnecessary to dwell with annalistic minuteness upon the long period of Blackie's professoriate in Edinburgh, extending over thirty years. The great literary event of that time was his publication of a translation of the *Iliad*, issued in four bulky volumes, in 1866. It is a wonderful production in many ways. For scholars, its chief value will be found in the dissertations and the notes. The initial difficulty of the choice of a metre which would make the English reader familiar with antique Grecian thought in an agreeable and familiar dress, was not so happily surmounted as in the translation of Æschylus. The fourteen-syllabled measure which Blackie adopted was too wasteful in its fluency, too apt to become paraphrastic, and—inexcusable error—too monotonous to hold the reader's attention. There are passages that contain very clever intercalary rhymes, and very spirited descriptions; but often the jog-trot measure descends into a 'wearifu' wobble, and the effect is marred by the very regularity of the poetic feet. Despite his sympathy with German thought, Blackie was an uncompromising opponent of Wolf and the 'myriad-Homer' theorists. He scorned the 'higher criticism' on this subject. Homer was to him as real a single personality as Burns or Scott; and on this point he nailed his colours to the mast, and shouted 'No surrender!' Nevertheless his *Iliad* did not settle the matter, and his strong assertions provoked the attacks of the critics. A superfine reviewer was daring enough to say that 'Professor Blackie knows many things, but he does not know Greek'—a remark which betrayed the ignorance, the presumption, and the animus of the anonymous writer. There is accurate scholarship to be found in these four volumes, whatever Southern critics may say; and though

slight errors may be discovered on a microscopic scrutiny, they are errors in judgment, not in knowledge. And if even Homer be allowed to nod, surely some latitude may be given to his humble translator.

It was neither by his *Æschylus* nor his *Homer*, laborious as these were, that Blackie became known to a very wide circle of readers. His little volume entitled *Self-culture*, published first in 1873, and since re-issued almost annually, did more to bring him face to face with the great world that lies outside the Universities than his most scholastic works. In a letter addressed by Blackie, some years ago, to the present writer, he says:—‘Verily, this is the day of small books.’ This was the result of his experience with *Self-culture*. He found that the condensed wisdom contained in less than a hundred pages appealed powerfully to the very class for whom it was written; and its influence upon the young men who have read it and pondered its maxims must have been very great.

A visit paid to Oban in 1863 had led him to fix his residence at Altnacraig near ‘the Brighton of the Hebrides,’ and this continued to be his Highland home for many years. It was during the earlier years of his stay at Altnacraig that his attention was first directed to the Gaelic language; and his enthusiasm for this ancient form of speech, as every one knows, resulted in his carrying through triumphantly the proposal to found a Gaelic Chair at Edinburgh University. Since Blackie’s death a rather ungracious attack has been made upon him ‘in the house of his friends,’ and he has been accused of being a mere pretender to a knowledge of Gaelic. That he was not a profound Gaelic scholar may be admitted, for that he never professed to be; but his enthusiasm for the preservation of the language was unbounded, and—what is more to the purpose—effectual. His book on *The Language and Literature of the Highlands* is at least a useful and (strange to say) unprejudiced contribution to the Ossianic controversy, as well as an interesting account of recent Gaelic poetry. It was Blackie’s love for the Scottish Highlands that led him to espouse the cause of the Crofters, and to work with voice and



pen earnestly on their behalf. Possibly his enthusiastic nature induced him to over-state the case for the Crofters, but that was a venial fault, and savoured least of all of quackery.

Of the busy years that followed Blackie's retirement from the Greek Chair it is not needful to speak. He was so largely before the public in some form or other, as lecturer, writer of newspaper-letters, or agitator, that his name was a household word throughout the land. In his fancied seclusion and well-earned repose, he was like David in the Cave of Adullam, for 'every one that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him,' and he became the champion of the oppressed, and sent none sorrowfully away. This was the true secret of his popularity. Unlike the majority of humankind, who become soured and querulous as age steals over them, Blackie retained the dews of his youth when he had passed far beyond the allotted span. Though learned as a pundit, he could kindly sympathise with the perplexed youth's first struggles in the initial mysteries of Greek. Secure in his later years from all danger of poverty, his ear was ever open to the cry of penury. Bitterness or animosity had no place in his heart. His sympathies went out towards all mankind, not merely in a rhetorical figure of speech, but actually. Such a man need not be a great philologist, a profound metaphysician, and an eminent poet to win the affectionate regard of men. It is the *human* element in him that makes the whole world kin. Of him it might be said as it was of another large-hearted poet:—

'Nature on thee the poet's power bestowed,  
A genial humour, and a trenchant wit,  
That now like mild heat-lightning gleamed and glowed,  
Now with a sudden flash life's centre hit.

'All the great gifts that lavish Nature gave  
By study, culture, art, were trained and formed.  
As scholar, critic, poet—gay or grave—  
The world to thee with heart responsive warmed.'

Blackie's closing years were brilliant as a glowing sunset that gilds even the approaching clouds of night. He sank gradu-



ally, but not under mental eclipse; the twilight of his life was not protracted. On Saturday, 2nd March, 1895, John Stuart Blackie expired, in the eighty-sixth year of his age. Never was there one more worthy to have the pious wish engraven over his resting-place which formed the epitaph on many an ancient Grecian tomb:—

‘ Let the earth that lies above him,  
Gently on his bosom rest.’

A. H. MILLAR.

---

ART. III.—ITALY UNDER THE LOMBARDS.

1. *Italy and her Invaders*, Vol. V.; *The Lombard Invasion* (553-600); and Vol. VI., *The Lombard Kingdom* (600-744). By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. At the Clarendon Press, 1895.
2. *Proischozdenie feodalnykh otnoshenii v langobardskoi Italii*. By P. VINOGRADOV. St. Petersburg, 1880.

MR. HODGKIN'S labours on the conquest and government of Italy by the Lombards will earn for him even a deeper sense of gratitude from historical students than any of his earlier volumes. For two reasons: in the first place, he had to deal here with much more difficult materials; and in the second place, he has filled an empty place on a shelf in our historical library. So completely was the Lombard period neglected in England that the ordinary reader, who had no access to foreign books or the original authorities, did not know where to find a list of the Lombard kings.\* Gibbon briefly described the conquest and the foundation of the kingdom in his forty-fifth chapter, but then the subject virtually glides out of his field. We should therefore be prepared to

---

\* The want, however, of a summary of Lombard history was supplied two years ago by Mr. Oman in his *Europe*, 476-918 A.D.

welcome a book covering this period, even if its author were a far less able historian than Mr. Hodgkin, as supplying a long-felt need.

Some years ago, in this *Review*, and on other occasions, I have had opportunities of respectfully expressing an opinion on Mr. Hodgkin's historical work. It may seem almost unnecessary to add anything now to what I have said before; and superfluous to praise where merit is so long established and so amply approved. But, as I have already observed, the difficulties of this part of Mr. Hodgkin's task seems to me to have been greater, owing to the less satisfactory nature of the materials with which he had to work, and to the fact that he had less help here from predecessors. It was an easier task, with the *Gothic War* of Procopius before him, to fascinate his readers with a spirited narrative of the wars of Belisarius, than to transform Paul's *History of the Lombards* into a readable relation and treat the many problems which the confusion or silence of our scanty sources give rise to. Many a writer who might succeed where Gibbon had succeeded—in telling the stories of Alaric and Attila, in describing the achievements of Theodoric and Justinian—might easily fail when he came to articulate the history of the disjointed Italy of Grimwald or of Liutprand. It is not therefore superfluous to say that the breath of Mr. Hodgkin's Clio has been strong enough to make the dry bones live. He has given us two volumes which rivet the attention throughout, and he has treated the problems which occur with admirable lucidity and judiciousness.

In this paper I propose to call attention to a few of the interesting subjects which meet us in these volumes. Having peered into the misty dimness of the Langobardic fore-world, we may consider the complicated distribution of Italy into Teutonic and Imperial territory after the Lombard conquest. The striking figure of Gregory the Great will arrest our glance, and we may then turn over the codes of Rotharis and Liutprand, which illustrate often, in an amusing way, the society and manners of the Lombard nation. The weightier questions connected with their institutions and the political state of Italy during this period cannot be overlooked: and

we may finally glance at the policy of Pope Gregory II. and the question of the genuineness of his letters to Leo the Isaurian.

I. It may be regarded as an established fact that in the days of the early Cæsars the Langobardi dwelt in the regions of the lower Elbe. This rests on the evidence of Strabo, Tacitus, and Ptolemy. Whether the original Langobardia was on the right or the left bank of the river we may be content to leave an open question. If on the right bank, as Strabo says—and to this opinion I incline—then they were never subjects of Rome, and were not included in the short-lived province of Germany which was formed by Drusus and lost by Varus. But in any case they came into contact with the Romans, for a moment, whether as subjects or merely as neighbours. It is interesting to observe that their territory on the north side adjoined that of the Angles, who adored the earth-goddess Hertha. Whether the Lombards also worshipped this great deity, is not known; Mr. Hodgkin would like to believe that they did—that ‘the Angle and the Langobard of the first century after Christ, the ancestors of Bede and of Anselm, of Shakespeare and of Dante, jointly adored the mother of mankind.’ As for the name of the Langobardi, Mr. Hodgkin is inclined to believe in the old explanation ‘Longbeards,’ and is not beguiled by the rival derivations from *barta* ‘axe’ (‘Long-axe-men’) or *bord* ‘board, bank’ (‘Long-shore-men.’) According to the saga, which is preserved in the work of the national historian Paul, the original name of the Lombards was Winnili, and Odin himself (*Godan* is the form used by Paul) bestowed upon them the new name. The tale was that the Winnili, attacked by the Vandals, prayed to Odin, who replied, ‘Whomsoever I shall look first upon at sunrise, to that nation will I give the victory.’ Then two leaders of the Winnili and their mother besought Freya to be gracious to them, and she ‘counselled them that at sunrise the Winnili should all assemble before Odin’s eastern window, having their wives with them, and that the women should let down their hair and encircle their faces with it, as it were a beard. Then,

when the sun was rising, Freya turned upon her couch, and awoke her husband, and bade them look forth from the eastern window. And he looked and saw the Winnili and their wives with their hair about their faces, and said, 'Who are these long-bearded ones?' Then said Freya to Odiu, 'As thou hast given them the name of Langobardi, so give them the victory.' And he gave them the victory, and from that day the Winnili were called the Langobardi.' Under this pretty tale there may well lurk a genuine tradition of hostilities between Lombard and Vandal. The saga contains some other points which deserve attention. The name Winnili probably represents a genuine tradition too; but the statement that they originally lived in Scandinavia must be received with caution. On the other hand, when we read that 'they came to the region which is called Scoringa,' we may well have the true name of their original home on the Elbe.

Of their actual history we know from Roman sources that they belonged to the empire of Marbod, and that they revolted from him and joined his enemies the Cherusicans. In the time of Tacitus they are still in their old home near the mouth of the Elbe, nor have they migrated when Ptolemy wrote his geography; but in the reign of Marcus we find that they have left their northern abodes and moved southward to the banks of the Danube. A writer of the sixth century, Peter the Patrician, who probably derived his information from Dion Cassius, states that 'the Lombards and Obii, having crossed the Danube,' were routed by an imperial general (c. 165 A.D.) After this slight notice, preserved by chance, we lose sight of the Lombards for more than three hundred years. During that time they doubtless lived obscurely in Central Europe, north of Pannonia, submitting to the rule of Hermanric the Goth, and at a later date included in the empire of Attila the Hun. At length in the reign of Anastasius they appear again on the stage of history. A war breaks out between them and their neighbours the Heruls, who occupied regions south of the Lombards, perhaps in the vicinity of the river Theiss. The result of a great battle was that the Heruls were well-nigh abolished (508 A.D.) We need not follow the brief

account of the internal history of the Lombards during the next forty years as given by their historian. Audoin became their king in the year 546 A.D., and his reign was marked by a great feud with the Gepids and by a migration to a new home. The powerful Gepidæ were settled in Pannonia; and Justinian adopted the policy of playing off Lombard and Gepid, who were mutually jealous, against one another. With this end, he granted the Lombards territory within the Empire adjoining that of the Gepids. In 550 envoys of the two nations appeared before Justinian, and Procopius has put in their mouths remarkable speeches. Justinian generally helped the Lombards because they were the smallest nation. The struggle continued, until, after Justinian's death, the Lombards united their forces with the Avars, savage new-comers of Hunnic or Turkish race, and their joint army annihilated the Gepid kingdom. This was probably in 567 A.D. The Avars occupied the Gepid lands, and the Lombards went forth in the next year, under the leadership of Alboin, to seek yet a new home in Italy, which had so recently been recovered by the Empire.

The question whether the Lombards belonged to the Low-German or High-German stock must be briefly noticed. Advocates of both views have been found. At the first glance, when we remember where their earliest home was, in the neighbourhood of Danes, Angles, Picts, and Saxons, we are inclined to declare without hesitation that they must have been Low-Germans. And this view is supported by Bluhme, who has made a special study of Lombard law and custom. He points out remarkable analogies with Anglo-Saxon laws and customs, and also many linguistic resemblances. But, on the other hand, it has to be admitted that, by the test of Grimm's law, some Lombard names are distinctly of High-German form. *Alboin*, for example, would in Low-German be *Alfwin*. Hence Jacob Grimm, and recently Dr. L. Schmidt, decided that the Lombard origin was High-German. Neither of these opposing views satisfactorily explains the facts on which the other side builds up its case. Mr. Hodgkin's conclusion is therefore very welcome. He professes to see in the Lombards 'a race originally of Low-German origin, coming from the

coasts and islands of the Baltic, and closely akin to our own Anglo-Saxon forefathers,' but modified by long contact with High-German peoples after the middle of the second century. This is a perfectly reasonable theory.

Of the dress and appearance of the Lombards we know something from an account preserved of a picture of their deeds, which was painted for the palace which Theudelinda built for herself at Monza (c. 600 A.D.):—

'In this picture it is clearly shown how, at that time, the Lombards cut the hair of their heads, and what was their dress, and what their habit. For, in truth, they made bare the neck, shaving it up to the back of the head, having their hair let down from the face as far as the mouth, and parting it on either side from the forehead. But their garments were loose, and for the most part made of linen, such as the Anglo-Saxons are wont to wear, adorned with borders woven in various colours. Their boots were open almost to the extremity of the great toe, and kept together by crossing boot-laces. Later on, however, they began to use hosen (*osis*), over which the riders drew waterproof leggings [or scarlet gaiters? *tubrugos birreos*]. But this fashion they copied from the Romans' (p. 154).

II. The Lombard conquest of Italy was never completed. Ravenna was not captured till the eve of the fall of the Lombard kingdom itself, two hundred years after the Lombards first set foot in the peninsula. Rome and Naples, Venice and southern Bruttii, Otranto (except for an instant), were never in the hands of the invaders. Most of the lands which they held permanently were conquered in the first three years after their coming; their subsequent advances were slow and interrupted, though sure. The chronology of these advances is in many cases doubtful. It has occurred to me that a table showing the dates (accurately or approximately as may be), as far as the conquests of Rothari, may be useful for reference, and I have consequently drawn up the following list:—

#### *Lombard Conquests.*

- A.D. 568 Forum Julii, Vicenza, Verona, and all Venetia; except the coast, Padua, Monselice, and Mantua.  
 569 Liguria, including Milan; except Ticinum (Pavia) and the Maritime coast. Also Cisalpine Gaul (except Cremona and some smaller places).



- 570-572 Central and Southern Italy partially conquered, including Tuscany and the duchies of Spoletium and Beneventum.  
 572 Ticinum (after a three years' siege); possibly Mantua and Placentia.  
 579 Classis (but lost 588; recovered and surrendered c. 720; taken by Liutprand, c. 725).  
 588 Insula Comacina.\*  
 590 (Lost Mantua, Placentia, Modena, Parma, Reggio, Altinum).  
 592 Suana (in Tuscany).  
 601 Padua.  
 602 Mons Silicis.  
 603 Cremona, Mantua (and perhaps about this time the other place which the Empire recovered c. 590), Vulturina (near Brixellum).  
 605 Orvieto, Bagnorea (Balneus Regis).  
 Before 640 Concordia; before 642 (?) Sipontum, cf. Hodgkin, vi., 516.  
 640 Maritime Liguria, Altinum, Opitergium.

From this table it will be seen that, during the first century of Lombard rule in the peninsula, there were three periods of conquest—(1) under Alboin, 568-572 A.D.; (2) under Agilulf, 601-605 A.D.; (3) under Rothari, 640 A.D. I have not included one or two places, which admit of discussion and require special comment, but before I refer to them it will be well to describe the geography of Italy about the year 600 A.D. (corresponding to Mr. Hodgkin's maps), by enumerating the parts which still remained to the Empire. In that year three powers held sway south of the Alps.

*Italy in 600 A.D.*

- I.—IMPERIAL. (a) *North*—Maritime Liguria; Cremona, Piacenza, Vulturina, Mantua, Monselice, Padua; Venetian coast; Concordia, Opitergium, Altinum; (also Modena, Parma, Reggio ?); Ravenna and the Aemilia; the Pentapolis (Ariminum, Pisaurum, Fanum, Senegallia, Ancona); the inland Pentapolis (Aesis, Forum Sempronii, Urbinum, Callis, Eugubium); Auximum.

---

\* The *νήσος Κομνηκεα* in Georgius Cyprius, 547, is Comiacum, north of Ravenna, as Gelzer has shown, and was of course Imperial in 600 A.D.

- (b) *Central*—Picenum (coast-land south of Ancona, including Firmum, Castrum Truentinum, Castrum Novum); Ortona (from the south on the Adriatic coast); Perusia; Rome and the ducatus Romae, from Urbs Vetus (Orvieto) in the north to Gaieta and Formiae in the south.
- (c) *South*—Part of Campania, including Naples, Salerno, Amalfi, Sorrento, Castrum Cumanum, Puteoli; from the south, Acropolis and Paestum; Bruttii; Calabria; Bari; Sipontum.
- (d) *Islands*—Sicily and small neighbouring islands; Elba. (Corsica and Sardinia belonged to the Exarchate of Africa).

II.—FRANKISH. Aosta and its valley; Susa and its valley.

These small regions belonged to the kingdom of Guntram (Burgundia) c. 588 (Hodgkin, v., 223), and probably remained Frankish for some time. Gelzer has pointed out that *κἀστρον Ζούρας* and *Ζουρίας* in George Cyprius (551 and 566) can hardly refer to Segusium.

III.—LOMBARD. The rest.

In this summary I have implied some slight changes in Mr. Hodgkin's map. I have claimed for the Empire some parts which he has given to the Lombard, or marked as neutral. (1) He leaves the island of Elba uncoloured either by Imperial red or Lombard green. It should be red. For a combination of two passages proves it to have been Roman at this period: Gregory, *Dial.*, iii., 11—sed cum Langobardorum gens cuncta uastasset ad Helbam insolam recessit (Cerbonius); and Georgius Cyprius (in his *Description of the Roman Empire*, c. 600), includes *κἀστρον Ἰλβας* (552; p. 29, ed. Gelzer). (2) Picenum was also Imperial, on the evidence of George the Cyprian, who mentions Ὀλκοῦσα (Asculus or Asculum) and *κἀστρον τερπεντινῶν* (Truentinum). (3) Ortona (mentioned in letters of Gregory; cf. George, 575, *κἀστρον Ὀρτονος*).

It is a question whether it would be more correct to colour as Imperial a continuous strip of country along the Flaminian way, from Toder in the south to Eugubium in the north. In the centre of this strip, where the road turns sharp, the

Romans held the strong town of Perugia; but Mr. Hodgkin marks Perugia as a red island in a green sea, so that Lombard Tuscany was doubly continuous with the Duchy of Spoleto. It does not matter much, for on the one hand, if the Romans had theoretically a continuous strip, the Lombards must have been practically allowed to go and come as they chose in times of peace; and on the other hand, if the regions south and north of Perugia were in Lombard territory, Perugia at all events, in time of war, was strategically the key to the position.

There are two other doubtful points on which I must touch. Mr. Hodgkin observes (v. 164): 'It was of great assistance to the cause of the invaders that they early obtained possession of Bologna, of Forum Cornelii (or Imola), and of the great fortress which guarded the tunnel pass of Furlo.' If Bononia was really taken by the Lombards (Paul does not mention it), when was it recovered by the Empire? For it was Imperial before the time of Liutprand, who captured it, and it is marked as Imperial in 600 A.D., as well as Imola, in Mr. Hodgkin's map. Petra Pertusa was burned to the ground and not occupied. Another difficulty relates to Brixellum (Brescello), the little town which had played a part in the civil wars of the memorable year of the Four Emperors (69 A.D.). We find it Imperial in 585 A.D., and held by Droctulf, a Lombard *dux*, who had deserted his own nation. Authari laid siege to it, and finally took it, and 'its walls were levelled with the ground' (Paul, iii. 18). Was the unwalled place kept by the Lombards or allowed to pass again into the hands of the Romans? The former alternative is suggested by the circumstances with which we next hear of it. In the campaign of Agilulf in 603 A.D., when Vulturina was taken, the garrison fled and 'set the town of Brixellum on fire.' Mr. Hodgkin observes that it, 'as a Lombard town, was now set on fire by the fleeing garrison of Vulturina.' But how are we to reconcile this with the fact that George the Cyprian in his description already referred to marks Brixellum as Roman (636 κάστρον Βριξιλλιον)? The solution, I suggest, is that the second of the two alternatives above-mentioned is the right one. Authari was content with dismantling

the city, and the place was perhaps again fortified by the Romans, who possessed a number of strongholds in the neighbourhood. Thus from 585 to 601 at least Brixellum was in the hands of the Imperialists. It was naturally attacked and seized by Agilulf in his campaigns of 601 to 603, and thus was Lombard when Vulturina was taken. This hypothesis will harmonize our various data. It may be observed here that Brintum, a fortress near Bononia, was also Roman about 600 A.D.

III. When the great Emperor Justinian who fills the stage of European history for such a large space of the sixth century passes out, the next actor who deserves the name of a protagonist, in a European sense, is Pope Gregory the Great. Mr. Hodgkin has written of him with much sympathy, and has made a minute study of his vast correspondence. To work through the rearrangement of the *Epistles* on the principles laid down by Ewald was a sufficiently laborious task, and Mr. Hodgkin has done a service in drawing up (in the form of an appendix; Note F.) a lucid introduction to the critical study of the letters. Of the style and contents of these letters he speaks as follows (V., 307):

'The chief monument of Gregory's life of practical statesmanship is the *Epistles*, composed by him during the fourteen years of his pontificate, arranged in fourteen books corresponding to those years, and filling nearly 500 closely printed pages. Though the writer despised all rhetorical artifices, and even allowed himself to speak disrespectfully of the rules of the grammarians, he wrote in a vigorous style, and his generally correct, if not polished, Latinity was utterly unlike the grammatical chaos which we find in the writings of his namesake of Tours. It is probably the very fact that he did not care to write rhetorically, which makes his writings so much pleasanter reading than the prolixities of Cassiodorus or the pompous obscurities of Eunodius. He does not, like the scholars of the Renaissance period, labour to give all his sentences a hexameter ending, but they are often instinct with manly and simple eloquence. Thus there is in them no affected imitation of Cicero, but often a true echo of Cæsar. These fourteen books of the *Epistles* of Gregory are a vast quarry out of which the student of early mediæval history may hew almost endless material. While the letters of the heathen Prefect, Symmachus, give us little beside hollow compliments and literary inanities, almost every letter of Gregory affords some information as to the politics, the morals, or the economics of his age.

In this respect it would be hardly too much to say that *Gregorii Epistolæ* are only surpassed, and not far surpassed, by the two great Codes of Theodosius and Justinian.'

It would be in vain to attempt to extenuate or explain away what Mr. Hodgkin terms the one great blot upon the escutcheon of Gregory 'his jubilation over the downfall of Maurice and his fulsome praise of the tyrant his successor.' The historian from whom Gregory's strong character extorts admiration regrets that 'his cruel enemy, the gout' did not carry him away a year sooner. Mr. Hodgkin's estimate is interesting (v., p. 452):

'We must admit that a man of deep spiritual discernment, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his Master, would not have written either the congratulatory epistles to Phocas or many another letter in the great collection, which denotes impatience and an angry temper. On the whole, it seems safer to judge him as a great Roman, than as a great saint;—and thus considered, his generosity, his justice, his courage, entitle him to a high place among the noblest names of his imperial race. In estimating his character we must never forget that, during all his public life, he was almost incessantly tortured by disease. That little passage in his biography which describes how he used to train the choir in the convent which had been his father's house seems to me emblematic of much in the life of Gregory. In the midst of a tumultuous and discordant generation it is his to bear witness to the eternal harmony. But he is stretched upon the bed of sickness; his frame is racked by pain; he holds the rod of discipline in his hand, and ever and anon, as he starts up to chastise the offender, he feels a sharper tinge than usual of his ever present agony; and this gives an energy to his stroke and a bitterness to his words, of which he himself is hardly conscious.'

IV. There are two great periods of Lombard legislation; that of Rothari in the middle of the seventh century, and that of Liutprand in the first part of the eighth. The two chapters which Mr. Hodgkin devotes to their laws are so full of interesting matter touching the manners and customs of the Lombards that I should like to quote from them copiously, especially as to the interesting questions connected with the *guidrigild* or the price of blood (for which the relatives of a murdered man could compound with the murderer), and the tariff of compensation for bodily injuries. I must be content with selecting from the earlier chapter Mr. Hodgkin's history of a Lombard courtship and marriage, and from the later one

of several trivial but interesting incidents which came before the notice of King Liutprand.

Some of the provisions respecting marriage remind Mr. Hodgkin

'of the discussions which take place in many a French farmhouse at the present day concerning the precise amount of the dot of the daughter of a thrifty *propriétaire*. When a Lombard suitor asked for the hand of a woman in marriage, if her guardian accepted him, a ceremony of betrothal was solemnized and a written contract (*fabula*) was drawn up between the parties. The suitor covenanted to give a price which was called the *meta* [*cp.* English *meed*]; and some substantial guarantor joined in the covenant with him. If all went well, the father or brother in whose *mundium* the bride had hitherto been, gave, probably on the eve of the wedding, a certain dowry to the bride which was called her *faderfio* [father-fee]. To this was added on the morning after the marriage a substantial present from the newly wedded husband to his wife, according to the universal custom of the German tribes the *morgin-cap* (morrow-gift, *morgen-gabe*). 'But if the progress of the suit were not prosperous, and if the solemn betrothal did not ripen into marriage, the laws of Rothari had much to say about that contingency. If for two years after the betrothal the suitor kept on delaying the fulfilment of his promise, the father or brother or he who had the *mundium* of the affianced woman might exact from the guarantor the payment of the *meta* and might then give the damsel in marriage to another. But perhaps the suitor alleged as a reason for his refusal that the woman had lost her chastity. In that case her parents must get twelve neighbours or kinsfolk to swear with them that the accusation was false. If they could do this the woman's reputation was considered to be cleared, and the suitor must either take her to wife or pay a double *meta* as a penalty for the wrongful accusation. If, however, for her sins it should happen that a woman was sorely afflicted after her betrothal, if she became a leper or a demoniac, or lost the sight of both eyes, then the suitor might reclaim his *meta* and was not bound to take her in marriage.

'Once married the woman passed under the *mundium* of her husband, and if she survived him remained under the *mundium* of his representative. If she had a son grown to adolescence it seems probable that he would be her guardian, but of course that would not often be the case, and she would then be under the *mundium* of some brother or kinsman of her late husband, who might be indisposed to relinquish the profitable trust. The royal legislator therefore clearly stated that the widow had a right to be-take herself to another husband if he was a free man. In this case the second husband was bound to repay to the heir of the first half of the *meta* which had been paid on the first espousals, and if the latter refused to accept this, then the wife might claim her whole *faderfio* and *morgin-cap*, and she returned under the *mundium* of her parents, who might give her in marriage to whom they would.'



Special provisions are made for the case of a man murdering his wife; and Mr. Hodgkin remarks that 'always, even in the presence of the ghastliest domestic tragedies, the Lombard legislator keeps a cool head and remembers to say what shall be the destination of the *faderfio* and the *morgin-cap*.'

Of the laws of Liutprand some are called forth by special incidents, which must have been exceptional. One instance may be quoted here:

'It has been reported to us that a certain man lent his mare to another man to draw his waggon, but the mare had an unbroken colt which followed its mother along the road. While they were thus journeying, it chanced that some infants were standing in a certain village, and the colt struck one of them with his hoof and killed it. Now when the parents brought the matter before us, and claimed compensation for the infant's death, we decided, after deliberation with our judges, that two-thirds of the child's *guidrigild* should be paid by the owner of the colt, and the remaining third by the borrower of the mare. True it is that, in a previous edict, it was ordained that if a horse injures any one with his hoof the owner shall pay the damage. But inasmuch as the horse was out on loan, and the borrower was a reasonable being and might, if he had not been negligent, have called out to the infants to take care of themselves,—therefore, as we have said, for his negligence, he shall pay the third part of the child's price.'

It must be added that a comparison between the laws of Rothari and Liutprand shows that the Lombards had socially developed in the seventy or eighty years which intervened. We cannot go into the details; but in Mr. Hodgkin's words:

'The laws of the later legislator breathe far less than those of his predecessor the atmosphere of the forest and the moorland. The laws about falcons, and stags, and swarms of bees have disappeared from the statute book, or at least require no fresh additions to be made to them, but instead thereof we have elaborate provisions for the enforcement of contracts and the preclusion of mortgages.'

V. The political institutions of the Lombards, the character of their government and the conditions of their subjects, offer a large and difficult field to the student of constitutional history. Many questions, especially in regard to the land-system and the legal position of the conquered Romans, are still matters of controversy and doubt. They have tried the learning and ingenuity of Savigny and Schupfer, Troya and Hegel,

Capponi and Capei, and last, but not least, the distinguished Russian scholar, Professor Vinogradov, whose work on early English institutions has attracted so much attention. But Vinogradov's valuable treatise on the *Origin of feudal systems in Lombard Italy*—I have placed the title at the head of this article—has not been translated and is so little known that I propose to call attention to some of his conclusions in connexion with Mr. Hodgkin's chapter on the 'Political State of Lombard Italy.'

In order to determine the condition of the Roman landed proprietors, it is necessary to understand clearly two passages of our historian Paul the Deacon, which have been very variously interpreted. No general measures respecting the conquered populations were taken by Alboin as far as we know; he died before he had completed the work of conquest. His successor Cleph contented himself apparently with the drastic measure of slaying or driving from Italy many powerful men among the Romans (Paul ii. 31.) But after his death the dukes found it necessary to organize their conquest. What they did is thus described by Paul (ii. 32):—

(a) Reliqui vero per hospites divisi, ut tertiam partem suarum frugum Langobardis persolverent, tributarii efficiuntur.

At the end of ten years the royal power was restored by the dukes, who devoted 'half of all the substance to the royal uses,' and on this occasion the conquered population are again dealt with:—

(b) Populi tamen adgravati per Langobardos hospites partiuntur.

Now when we take these two statements in close connexion, we can hardly doubt, as Vinogradov remarks, that the second expresses in an abridged form the same act—or, more strictly, a repetition of the same act—as the first. Taking this as the basis of interpretation, we can at once disprove a variety of rival views; e.g., that of Manzoni who took *populi* as genitive and explained *hospites* as the Romans; that of Capei who, translating *partiuntur* in an active sense, referred the statement to a spontaneous act of the natives; that of Troya who read *patiuntur*; that of Schupfer who interpreted the passage

of payments made by the Romans to Lombard officials (*hospites*). Nor can we admit the explanation of Capponi and Hegel, according to which *partiuntur* means 'remain divided'—far too great a demand on the present tense. The simple and natural meaning of the words is that the same thing was done, when the royal power was revived, as had been done before by the dukes in the various duchies. In other words, the plan of dealing with the Roman *possessores*, adopted by the dukes, is organized anew, systematically, throughout the kingdom.

These general measures affected all the Roman proprietors directly; they themselves, not their lands, were divided among the Lombards, to whom they had to give a certain *tributum* of the produce. Thus they were still proprietors, for their land was not taken from them; they were not serfs, but the unwilling 'hosts' of Lombard 'guests.' On the other hand they were not perfectly free, for they were *tributarii*. But it is important to observe that theoretically they were not bound to the soil. This is proved by the position of the *tertiatores*, the descendents of these proprietors—in the Terra di Lavoro in the eighth century. Hence we must conclude that the received view (which Mr. Hodgkin adopts) that the Roman proprietors passed into the class of the *aldii* can hardly be correct. For the *aldius* was a serf, like the Frank *letus*. Hence Vinogradov infers that the proprietors were probably included in the class of *homines pertinentes*.

The measures mentioned by Paul, which affected the proprietors directly, affected their dependents indirectly. Those who worked as serfs on the soil of the Roman squire before the conquest worked in the same way after the conquest, and in the eyes of the Lombard law were regarded as *aldii*. It is impossible to accept the view of those who would make out that the Lombard codes did not concern the Roman population. Vinogradov's conclusion that Roman slaves, coloni, and free folk were included respectively in the Lombard classes of slaves, *aldii*, and free folk (including *homines pertinentes*) seems far the most probable.

In cases where the proprietors had been slain or banished,

the land passed into the hands of the dukes or the king. These rulers made grants to their followers, to reward their services and secure their loyalty. But the principle on which these grants were made was far more for the interest of those who received than of those who gave. In the first place they were grants in perpetuity; no limits of time were imposed as in the case of ecclesiastical grants. The consequence of this was that every estate granted by a duke tended to exhaust his capital. In the second place, no conditions were attached to the grants, which conferred full proprietary rights. It is obvious that the moral obligation of service to the benefactor was likely to be faintly remembered and laxly interpreted. In the course of time the Lombard rulers came to recognise the defects of this system. Accordingly we find King Liutprand granting land on long leases. We also find him conceding the practical enjoyment of a property without any legal agreement or prescription. Such lands could be resumed at any time, unless the occupier could prove that his actual tenure exceeded sixty years—according to a law of King Liutprand. From its nature this mode of land-tenure left few traces of its existence—for its very basis was the absence of legal documents.

In regard to the government of the country, Mr. Hodgkin (following here in the footsteps of Hegel) explains very fully the nature and extent of the royal power (vi., p. 567 s. 22.). 'The king of the Lombards,' he says, 'if he were a man of any force of character, was able to make his will felt very effectively, at any rate through all the north of Italy.' It is moreover important to observe that the people had not only no influence in political questions (this co-operation in legislation was a mere formality), but—and this marks a great contrast with Gaul and England—had no importance even in local matters, hardly any part in the administration of justice. This has been well brought out by Vinogradov (p. 131).

The question of the position of the Dukes and the Gastalds, and their relation to one another has been much debated. Pabst in his *Geschichte des langobardischen Herzogthums* developed a theory which attracted considerable attention. According to his view both the duke and the gastald derived

their powers from the king, and while both had judicial functions and hence are spoken of as *iudices*, (a), the duke's sphere was military, the gastald's financial, (b), the duke was appointed for life, the gastald for a limited period. From this point of view, Pabst determines the main lines of constitutional development in the two centuries of Lombard history. He distinguishes three periods: (1,) 584-640 A.D.; the special and more private interests of the king in the duchies are represented by the gastalds who keep the dukes in check. We might compare the position of the *procurator* in the Roman Empire, who managed the Emperor's fiscal business in each province, and always acted as a check, sometimes as a spy, on the governor. (2,) The following seventy or eighty years are a period of transition. (3,) In the third period which begins with the reign of Liutprand, the royal power is paramount in the duchies, and in some cases the gastalds have ousted the dukes and have had the complete government of provinces (e.g., in Parma, Piacenza, etc.) The exceptions are the great southern Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, in which the gastalds are appointed by the Dukes. Pabst tries to prove his thesis by a comparison of the laws of Rothari with those of Liutprand.

But ingeniously as Pabst has worked out his theory, it will not sustain criticism, and Vinogradov had no difficulty in refuting it. Pabst makes two mistakes: he underrates the independence of the Duke, and he overrates the contrast between his first and third period in regard to the growth of the royal power. The fact of the Duke-period, before the death of Cleph and the election of Authari, is alone enough to make us doubt the view that the ducal power was derived by delegation from the king. When we add to this the circumstances not only that the duchy was held for life, but that in those duchies of whose histories we have in some measure a connected record—Spoleto, Benevento, Friuli—we find the dukedom hereditary, we can no longer hesitate to reject Pabst's view. Of the dukes of the Lombards, when they dwelt in Pannonia or on the Elbe, we know nothing, but as far as the Italian kingdom is concerned, we may say with certainty that the



difference between duke and gastald was a difference in kind, not in degree, and that the duke was not a mere royal officer, but, equally with the king himself, a national institution. The question of the legal power of the king over the duke is another matter; the question of his actual power yet another. And in regard to the growth of the royal power in the later period at the expense of the dukes, Pabst has greatly exaggerated the facts, and has, as Vinogradov points out, taken into account only the reign of the powerful and energetic Liutprand, excluding from his vision the history of Liutprand's successors. But the last years of the Lombard kingdom tell a different story, and are very far from pointing to the conclusion that royalty had a stronger constitutional position than in the days of Rothari. The collapse of the kingdom on the first attack without was due to the inherent weakness of the central power and the strength of the centrifugal forces, that is, the dukes. But here we touch on events which are reserved for the seventh and final volume of Mr. Hodgkin's monumental work.

The royal power was further, in some measure, diminished by the circumstance that the right of keeping a retinue of followers—a *comitatus* or *Gefolgschaft*—did not exclusively belong to him. The laws of Lombard society permitted private persons to maintain a *gasindium* (as the *comitatus* is called in the Lombard laws), and the right belonged pre-eminently to the dukes. Mr. Hodgkin does not touch on this question of the private *comitatus*, which has been disputed by some; but it seems to me that Vinogradov has shown that the evidence of its existence is clear. Two passages in the laws are sufficient to prove it (Rothari, 225, and Rachis, 11), of which one is as follows:—'*Si alequid in gasindio ducis aut privatorum hominum obsequium donum munus conquisivit.*'

There are other interesting questions in connexion with the Lombard government, such as the absence of any system of public taxation, for which I have left myself no room. Nor can I enter upon the political state of Imperial Italy to which Mr. Hodgkin devotes a most valuable chapter, and which has been elucidated in recent years by the researches of Diehl and



L. Hartmann. I will only venture on two observations in regard to Venice. I cannot discover whether Mr. Hodgkin holds Venetia and Istria were separate provinces in the eighth century or formed one province. I submit that they formed one province, and that Diehl is mistaken in supposing otherwise. The proof is in Paulus Diaconus, ii. 14: *Venetia etiam Histria conectitur et utraque pro una provincia habentur*. The other observation concerns the institution of the Dukes or Doges. As to the date of the first Doge Mr. Hodgkin expresses himself very guardedly 'somewhere about the year 700' (vi., p. 485). His cautiousness is thoroughly justified. 713 is the date given by John the Deacon, 697 is that of Dandolo, and it can be shown that each arrived at his year by calculations based on uncertain data, and without distinct evidence before him. Dandolo, in fact, saw that John's date was inconsistent with other data, and tried to amend it. I doubt, however, whether Mr. Hodgkin, who here inclines more to Dandolo, has hit the mark with his approximate 700. The view of those who hold that the second Doge, Marcellus, and the third, Ursus, are, not historical, but legendary figures seems extremely likely. And, if we get rid of them, we are naturally led to place the foundation of the Ducal office in the pontificate of Gregory II., and bring it into connexion with the general movement of reaction against the rule from New Rome, which marked the Italian politics of that period.

VI. Pope Gregory II., Mr. Hodgkin writes, 'was a man with much of the true Roman feeling which had animated his great namesake and redecessor, but with more sweetness of temper, and he had played his part in a difficult and dangerous time with dignity and prudence, upholding the rights of the Church and the claims of the Holy See as he understood them, but raising his powerful voice against the disruption of the Empire. By a hard fate his name has been in the minds of posterity connected with some of the coarsest and most violent letters that were ever believed to have issued from the Papal Chancery—letters more worthy of Boniface VIII. than of the "sweet reasonableness" of Gregory II.' These are the letters of

which Gibbon said, 'If they cannot be praised as the most perfect models of eloquence and logic, they exhibit the portrait, or at least the mask, of the founder of the papal monarchy.' Mr. Hodgkin, however, agreeing with the Abbé Duchesne, who has recently edited the *Liber Pontificalis*, and some other critics, believes that these letters were not written by Gregory, and that the letters which the Pope did address to the Emperor either do not exist, or have not yet been discovered.

The external evidence for the letters is not good. At the Council of Nicaea, which was held when the Empress Irene restored image-worship, Gregory's epistles to the Emperor and to the Patriarch were read. In the Acts of that Council the epistle to the Patriarch was preserved, but not those addressed to the Emperor. At the end of the sixteenth century Fronton le Duc copied the Greek text of two letters, purporting to be those from Gregory to Leo, from a manuscript at Rheims, which had belonged to the Cardinal of Lorraine. No suspicion rests on the integrity of Fronton le Duc. He sent his copies (along with a Latin version which he made himself) to Baronius, who printed them in his *Annales Ecclesiastici*, and from that work they found their way to the late collections of the Acts of the Councils.

Five other Greek manuscripts of the same letters have been discovered since; the oldest dates perhaps from the tenth century. But our suspicions are raised by the facts that they were not included in the Acts of the Council of Nicaea, and that the Latin originals are not forthcoming.

Leaving the external evidence aside as indecisive, and considering the contents of the epistles, Mr. Hodgkin notices the following points:—(1) Blunders in Scripture history—Uzziah (instead of Hezekiah) is named as the destroyer of the Brazen Serpent, and David is said to have brought the Brazen Serpent into the Temple; (2) The extraordinary insolent and rude tone of the letters, which it is highly improbable any Pope of that time, and especially Gregory II., would have adopted; (3) There seems to be a chronological error as to the date of Leo's accession; (4) Leo is reproached for having killed 'I

know not how many women, in the presence of honourable men from Rome, from France, from the Vandals, from Mauritania, from Gothland, and to speak in general terms, from all the Western interior.' 'Is it conceivable,' Mr. Hodgkin asks, 'that a Roman Pope would talk of these vanquished nationalities in this way in the year 727? Some Eastern ecclesiastic or Greek rhetorician writing from the longitude of Constantinople, knowing little of "the Western interior," and thinking only of the victories of Belisarius and Narses, might easily use these mouthfilling names, but surely not Pope Gregory II. ; (5) It is stated that the Lombards occupied Ravenna. Admitting that such an event may have occurred, Mr. Hodgkin observes that 'the attempt to find a place for it without disturbing the natural order of events has hitherto made the reign of Liutprand the despair of Chronologers.' (6) 'To the distance of 24 stadia,' threatens the writer of one of the letters, 'the Pontiff will remove into Campania, and then—you may chase the winds.' Gibbon called attention to the difficulty: 'this proximity of the Lombards is hard of digestion.' The frontier of the Duchy of Rome on the Campanian side must have been, as Mr. Hodgkin says, nearly one hundred miles from Rome.

While then the external history of the letters is calculated to raise suspicion, though not decisive either way, the internal difficulties with which they bristle certainly lead us to reject them. If we reject them some of the greatest difficulties which beset the history of the pontificate of Gregory II. disappear. As to the question who forged the documents, we may suppose with Duchesne that they were fabricated at Constantinople to supply the place of the genuine letters, which had been accidentally lost.

Mr. Hodgkin has also discussed with judgment the genuineness of two letters of Gregory III. in regard to the recovery of Ravenna,—one to the Patriarch of Grado, the other to Duke Ursus; and he accepts the former. In criticizing the latter, it should, I think, be remembered that the received date of the dukedom of Ursus is by no means beyond question.

All his readers will look forward with much interest to Mr.

Hodgkin's concluding volume, in which he will have to describe the curious collapse of the Lombard power and deal with the policy of Charles the Great, which inaugurated a new era in the relations of Italy with Northern Europe.

J. B. BURY.

---

#### ART. IV.—LEGENDARY LORE OF THE INNER HEBRIDES.

ON that side Albainn which lies towards the setting sun are many isles: Arran, anciently called Ar-Fhinn, Fingal's hunting ground; Iona, the Isle of Waves; Mull, the giant of the Inner Hebrides; Skye, the Isle of Mist; Colonsay of the temples, Islay, and many more. For countless ages the fierce tides of the Atlantic have beat against the shores of these islands, for countless ages the voice of the sea has been in the ears of the islesmen. That voice they have come to know and to love, as a child knows and loves the voice of the mother who bore it. There are times when it is loud and clamorous; when it calls insistently for some soul to join the vast company of the silent; when it will not be stilled save by the sacrifice of some human life. There are times when the voice is gentle and soft, when the movement of the sea is rhythmic and peaceful as the breathing of a slumbering babe. But alike in storm and in calm the surging ocean encircles and moulds the lives of the islesmen.

It was not always thus: yet the tides have ebbed and flowed a myriad times since Eiré and all the Western Isles of Scotland formed a land which lay near by the coast of Gallia. The story goes thus:—

There lived in that remote time a race of sea-rovers so strong and dauntless that whatever they elected to do, they did; their ships were countless as the bells on a heather-clad hill, and their men were to be numbered only as the waves of the sea.

It came about that these sea-rovers saw and loved well a land that rose fair as a lily out of the water, albeit they loved not the

place where it was set. So when they had conquered it, they said, 'We will draw this island in the wake of our fleet to a spot in the sea where the water is clear and blue, to a place where the north wind comes straight from the region of eternal snow. There shall we live.' Then they fashioned a four-strand cable of a wondrous thickness, and the strength of it was as the strength of the cords that hold the world in space. Each of the four strands was of a different substance: the first was of heather, the strength of the hills; the second was of hemp, the strength of the fields; the third was of wool, the strength of the beast; and through these three a fourth was intertwined, and it was of woman's hair, the strength and the glory of the human.

The galleys that lay round the fair land were counted in this wise: a thousand ships and a ship for every noon-tide in the season which is the Time of Peace; a like number for every lingering dusk in the yellow month; and for every dark night in the black month, and the months that are the dead months. For every day in the year there were a thousand ships and a ship. The rowers were large of stature and exceeding strong.

An enormous hole was bored in the hard rock on an outlying part of the island, and through it the four-strand cable was passed: thereafter the oarsmen bent to their oars. For a brief time their efforts were in vain, but soon the land came away from its ancient foundations with a loud roar. It lurched wildly from side to side as if about to sink below the waters made angry by the stirring of their depths; and then the island moved after the galleys whose thousand thousand seamen rowed each one with the power of a Fionn. Thus the Isle of Joy was towed safely through the blue-green waters round the southern coast of Britain. It was soon after this that an ominous sound was heard, and the sea-rovers saw with dismay a great rent across the land which they had uprooted. Of a sudden, the oarsmen felt that their burden was lightened by more than a half; then there was a gurgle of waves, a noise as of a sea monster sinking in the deep. A portion of the isle had broken off, and when the bottom touched the bed of the sea it rested there and has there remained to this day. It is no other than the land which is called Eiré, and it lies opposite to the coast of Cambria. Cala-



mity followed upon calamity. The wind was loosed, the storm spirit lashed the waves into fury. It was because of this that the Isle of Joy was torn to pieces, and, bit by bit, left behind. Despite the fury of the Elements of God, the sea-rovers persevered until, finally, as they came abreast of the South Land, the four-strand cable snapped; Long Island sank in the sea, while Lewis and the adjacent isles had to be abandoned. And to this day the hole through which these mighty men passed the cord is known as *Suil an Rodh*, 'the eye of the promontory,' on the western side of the Butt of Lewis.

It may be because of the wondrous passing of these Western Isles through the waters of the sea that the spirit of romance is ever about them. Mayhap too, that passing lingers as a veiled dream in the hearts of the islesmen, for it is in keeping with the strange light that shines in their eyes, the strange Gaelic runes which they chant, the strange practices which they reverence.

*An Fhèinn air a h-uilinn*, 'the Feinn (i.e., the Fianna, the Fingalian company) on its elbow,' is a saying known to the Gaels, and the reason for it is this. After doing many mighty deeds, Fionn and his men lay down spell-bound in a cave, and the place of that cave has no name—it may be on the remote shore of some Western Island, it may be on the shores of Albainn herself. At the entrance to the cave hangs a *dùdach*, and this horn sounded three times by a mortal shall awake the slumbering heroes, and they shall arise and be as they were in the days of old. A strange thing it is that happened. One day a hunter, groping about in a thick mist that rose from the sea, came upon the cave. He saw the suspended *dùdach*, and he saw the giant Feinn lying full length in the semi-darkness of the great rock hollow. It was thereafter that he put his lips to the *dùdach*, and blew with all the breath that was in him; then followed a blast that beat against the cliffs and rebounded with a force as of thunder.

When the hillsman looked into the cave, he saw that the heroes had opened their eyes and were staring, as corpses stare, without so much as moving a muscle of their huge bodies. The



fear was upon him, but he had been fed upon the goat's milk, foaming and warm, that gave strength to the men that were; so for the second time of the three blasts that should wake the Feinn, he put his mouth to the horn, and the noise of it sounded in that desolate place as the crash of the trumpet that shall awaken the dead from their sleep on the Day of Days.

At this the Feinn, every man of them, made a rapid movement as if to rise; but as each leaned on his elbow, he stopped like a thing turned to stone, with wild eyes staring out towards the hills, over which moved the drifting mist. The man had the courage of his father and his father's father, and, for a moment, he looked at the grim faces which confronted him: he even had it in his mind to sound the third of the three trumps. But the cry was in his ear, and he could do no other thing than flee from the dread place.

When he came to his kinsmen in the clachan he told them what had happened, and being of the same blood, and stout men at that, they determined to find the cave. Thereafter for many days they went out on the hills and by the sea, returning only when the gathering dusk made further search fruitless. But they sought in vain for the dwelling of the Feinn, and to this day it is not known to the islesmen. Fionn and his men in their rock-bound resting place, 'the Feinn on its elbow,' still await the third of the three blasts of the *dùdach* which is to rouse them into new life.

'Blessing on their going and blessing on their way! It is Friday, they will not be hearing us.' Thus whisper the hill-folk when they use words about the fairies, and that is seldom. Many times is the voice of the hill-wind heard in the forest, but it is rarely that the islesmen have the name of the 'quiet people' upon their lips. This nevertheless is a true thing. On a morning long ago, and it was not a Friday, a bold man of the West put a question to the fairies: 'It is the place that you come from that I would be knowing; and this too, the name of the man who was your father's father and his father?' The man had all the courage of his race, but he had trouble when he saw this answer writ in letters of fire under his feet:—

' We are not of the seed of Adam,  
And Abraham is not our progenitor ;  
But we are the offspring of the Haughty Father,  
Who out of Paradise was driven.'

Then he muttered: 'The Cross be between us,' and these are the words that saved him from the ill that was following close upon his foolish act.

By none are the quiet folk more loved than by the milk-maids of the Western Isles who give them their due on the Fairy Knowe; and this due is of the warm milk of the cow which old Fionn said is the best food of all food, for many a change comes out of it, butter and cheese are made of it, and it will feed a little child, and it will give strength to an old woman. The hill-folk know well how the quiet people love the milk that the cows give daily, while the soft Gaelic songs are crooned by their side. And therefore it is that at the milking in the morning, and at the milking in the evening, the Hebridean maids pour on the ground, from the *cuman* some of the new-drawn milk; and this is why the grass of the fairy raths is so emerald green.

Many are the tales told of the fairies who have stolen young babes and have left the fond mothers to grieve for a day and a year, mayhap even to the day of their passing, while around and about the haunted-mounds the beings who come of the seed of the Haughty Father make merry with dancing and song. It was not this which happened near Pladda which lies to the south of Arran; but the thing was no less strange.

A woman who dwelt there was heavy with child, when, in the solitudes of the night, she said: 'The cry is in my ear; God keep all who are dear to me.' Not many days passed before she was delivered of her babe; but no sooner had the child drawn its first breath than the quiet people came and carried away the mother. There was no star in the black night of the man who was her husband. Day by day passed, and the cloud that hung about his life did not lift. But once as he sat before the smouldering peats in the dusk that comes as the first breath of the darkness, the wraith of the woman stood before him, and he heard it say, 'The yearly riding is near at hand; and it is passing the shealing I shall be, with all the rout, when there is no

light on the hills or on the sea. Then it is throwing me my wedding gown you must be, for sure the babe is hungering for its mother, and you will be wanting the wife. I am laying it on you as a wish.' After this the heart of the man was faint; so that when the day of the riding came all his neighbours were in the shealing with him. The night was windless. A night of peace on sea, a night of peace on land. At last the jingling of bridles and the trampling of horses broke the stillness. The man rose to do the bidding of the wraith, but the neighbours laid their hands on him and would not suffer him to go out. Thereafter there was a bitter cry, a cry such as comes only from the mouth of those who have looked upon a thing more hideous than death; a great tumult; and then again there was peace. . . . When day broke it was seen that the low roof and the walls were smeared with blood. . . . Warm's the mother's breath, but the warmth and the sweetness of it were not for the babe of that island shealing.

Sure it is that Colum Cille, the Dove of the Church, must have loved well the kye; and this was one only of the many ways in which he fulfilled the seeing of his mother, Aithne, who, before his birth, dreamed that an angel came to her and gave her a robe—a robe so fair that the shade of every beautiful flower was reflected therein. And this thing is for the knowing in the Western Isles, that when the kye are left to graze on the hill-pastures, the herdswomen say, with a wave of the hand, 'The herding and the guardianship of the King of the Elements and the good St. Columba be on you.' It was the son of Aithne, too, who gave health to the cow of a widow woman:—

'The Charm made by St. Columba  
For the old wife's only cow.  
One foot on the sea, one foot on land,  
And another foot in the corral.  
Against worm, against swelling,  
Against red disease and *tairbhean*.  
May the *tairbhean* that's in your body  
Go to yonder hard stone.  
Health to you, beastie!'

Moreover it is told how Nesan, who had five heifers, gave food and shelter to the Saint one night long ago. And in the morning, the Holy Man said, 'It is bringing the kye before me that you will be; for I would be blessing them.' When the heifers stood before him, these are the words that he said: 'From this day thy five little heifers shall increase until the number of them shall be one hundred and five cows: and each one of the hundred and five shall be soft and beautiful, and their breath shall be sweet, and they shall be a blessing to you. It is Himself that is saying it.'

Here is another thing that the good Saint did. He had on the Isles two tenants: to the one God had given children, while the wife of the other was barren; but St. Columba received the same amount of produce and silver from each. Because of this the farmer who had no children came before the Holy Man, and said: 'By the hand of my father and my father's father, is it well that I give to thee each season the self-same measure as the man who has the seed that shall follow him?' Then the Saint answered: 'It is stealing the worth of twelve copper pieces from some one that you must be. But when all the months that are in a year shall have passed, it is restoring the thing to the man you shall also be.' And so it happened that one day, which was a blessed day for all the people of the isles, the man did the thing that St. Columba had said; indeed he stole from the holy Saint himself a small book wherein were many things written by the Dove of the Church.

It was with this book that the islesman sailed to the Outer Hebrides, and many were the people eager to learn what was traced therein; for it contained a multitude of sayings valuable for the cure of sickness in men and in cattle. And each one who saw the book gave to the farmer. The yellow month, and the black month, and the Time of Peace had passed before the islesman steered his boat towards the island which was his home. Soon after this he returned the sacred volume to St. Columba; but the Saint of Iona put it into the heart of the peats, and watched it slowly smoulder away. Now this is how the blessed *Eòlais*, the *Eòlais* which bring health and peace to the people, became known in every corner of the Western Isles.

It may be that this incantation for the protection of the kye was written in this very book :—

‘ Traversing hills, traversing woods,  
And gazing far and near,  
St. Patrick’s milkmaid attend you  
Till I see you well again ;  
The Charm made by Mary for her cattle,  
Early and late going to and coming from the pasture  
Protect you from pit and quagmire,  
From fens or morasses, and from each other’s horns ;  
From the filling of the red rock  
And from the swift-footed Fingalians.  
May St. Patrick’s milkmaid attend your footsteps,  
And scatheless may you again come home.’

Of the many *Eblais*, or drops of wisdom, that are used, or have been used, in the Western Isles here are one or two. The history of the first is this.

When Jesus and the Blessed Mary fled from their cruel persecutors, they came one nightfall to a shealing among the hills. The Son of the King of the Elements and the woman who was his mother were weary, for they had walked far that day, and the way had been hard. They knocked at the door and prayed for shelter and food, because the mouth of the night would be upon them in a brief while. Now the *bean-an-tighe*, the good wife, had a heart in her that was a kind heart, but her man, who was out on the hill-side, loved not to have strangers in the glow of his peat-fire. Therefore it was that the good wife sprinkled some chaff in a corner of the byre which had been newly cleaned ; and it was upon this chaff that *Iosa’s Moire* ‘*Mhathair*’ lay down to sleep. When the man of the house came in from the hills, he ate of that which was put before him, and then went to rest for the night. In the stillness of the dark hours he awakened with great pains in his side ; so evil were they, and for so long did they stay, that his wife said, ‘ Sure it is that the hour of my man is pursuing him.’ With this came the thought of the strangers who lay on the chaff in the byre ; and it was heart’s ease to her. Without so much as a moment’s waiting, the wife of the sick man went to where the woman and the child lay in a deep sleep. At the first call Jesus rose, and

came to the sick man : ' It is healing you I will be ; you who suffer from the stitch, or the spleen, or the knotting of the bowels.' These are the words of the *Eòlas* that Jesus said, and many times since then have they cured men of disease :—

' A gentle wife,  
A churlish husband ;  
Christ lying on the awns of corn,  
That will stop the *sealg*.'

The women of the Outer Isles who have on them the illness that is sweeter than health know how good a thing is the *Airne Mhoire*, the Nut of the Virgin Mary. They know that if a woman in travail takes the *Airne Mhoire* in her right hand and repeats thrice the blessed *Ave*, all will go well with her. In the Isle of Mist there grows a herb which was used in old times to allay the pains of child-birth, and to bear the woman to that shelter of peace that lies below every height of trouble. This potent herb was carried by the midwife as she moved *deiseil*, sunwise, round the woman, and repeated certain mystic words that are not for the knowing.

It is as black water over an islesman when the evil eye rests upon him, and hard this thing is to stay, nigh as hard as to bail out the waters of the full tide. Three ways or more there were to ward off, or to exorcise, this dread thing in the Isle which was the home of fair *Scathach*, the Amazonian queen who, it is said, has given her name to Skye. The first was to make the sign of the cross on the ground if one chanced upon a person with the eye ; and the next was to repeat a Gaelic verse when it was the time for the morning washing :—

' Let God bless my eye,  
And my eye will bless all I see ;  
I will bless my neighbour,  
And my neighbour will bless me.'

The third was a strange spell, and the meaning of it is hard to say. Three coins were put into a *claar* of hill-water, one for the Father, one for the Son, one for the Holy Spirit. After this a kinsman or a friend, and one to be trusted, knelt on his right knee and sprinkled the water over the man with the ill upon him. Here are the words that were spoken :—



' Eye will see you,  
Tongue will speak of you,  
Heart will think of you—  
The Three are protecting you—  
The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.  
Angus MacDonald,  
His will be done. Amen.'

*Geasa*, blessings and spells without number are known to the Gaels of the West. Many is the time that an islesman has been made invisible by the saying of these words: 'A magic spell I put on thee from dog, cat, cow, horse, man, woman, lad, lass, and little child, till I come again, in the name of the Trinity.' A *sian* not less potent—one which has oft-times added to the days of a dweller in the Hebrides—must be performed in a remote corner of some hill or glen. Here it is that he who is to be armed against the evil things sinks on his knees; the hand of the worker of the charm is then laid on the head of the kneeling man. After this the charmer, moving in a circle sunwise, repeats the Gaelic words of which the English is:—

' The Charm that Mary placed on her Son be on you,  
Charm from slaying, Charm from wounding,  
Charm between pap and knee,  
Charm between knee and breast on you,  
Charm of the Three in One on you,  
From top of head to sole of foot.  
Charm of seven *paters* once on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* twice on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* thrice on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* four times on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* five times on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* six times on you,  
Charm of seven *paters* of the seven *paters* going sunwise in lucky  
hour on you, a-keeping you from harm and accident.'

Then turning anti-sunwise, the seer continues:—

' The helmet of Salvation about your head,  
The ring of the Covenant about your neck,  
The Priest's breast-plate about your breast;  
If it be retreat on the rear,  
The shoes of the Virgin to take you swiftly away.  
Charm of the Three in One on you  
From crown of head to sole of foot,

And the Charm of the *pater* of the seven *paters*  
 A-going anti-sunwise and sunwise, sunwise and anti-sunwise,  
 To protect you from behind  
 From lead and from sword,  
 From wound and from slaying,  
 Till the hour and time of your death.'

Thereafter the kneeling man rises and leaves the mystic circle. The worker of the spell remains standing, and broods deep on this thing in the solitude until the time of the dusking.

All men are not as holy as was the good Colum Cille, to wit two men of Mull who did this thing. It was in the hearts of Alan MacLean and Lachlan MacLean to have more of the kye that all men love, more of the warm milk that is so good to the taste, more sheep whose bleating is sweet in the ears of the hill-folk. It may be that they forgot this saying of their fathers, that the thing which comes with the wind will go with the rain. Whether for this reason, or because there was blackness in their hearts, these men called Black Donald to aid them, and this by a barbarous spell. Once they were face to face with the devil, he would, for sure, give them that which they asked. For four days and four nights did Alan and Lachlan, hidden in the glooms of a forest, practise this dread charm: for all the hours in those days and nights, they roasted alive one cat after another, and these words were ever and always in their mouths: 'Whatever it is that you see, and whatever it is that you hear, keep the cat turning.' As night was falling on the fourth day, Black Donald appeared with a legion of dusky cats at his heels; and the yelling and the screaming of the demon host would have undone men less brave than the dauntless Alan and his comrade Lachlan. Shoulder to shoulder they faced the black horde which had come at their call. Still they kept the tortured cats turning before the peat-flames. So it was that the Enemy of Man granted them the thing that they asked; but the end which came to Alan and Lachlan MacLean is not known in the island of Mull.

*Cha ghluais brog no bruidheann an droch bhean-thighe.* Many is the wave that has broken on the shores of Mull since Ewen of

the Little Head so said to the woman who was his wife; yet the men of Mull use the self-same words to this day, because the story of Ewen is remembered. Ewen came of the Lairds of Loch Buy, and he took for wife a daughter of the house of MacDougall of Lorn. So shrewish was this woman, that she came to be known in that hill-country as *Gortag* (i.e., 'famine') the wife of Ewen. It was hereafter that Ewen had hard words with his father, and indeed the words came to blows. So great did this thing grow, that the old man called upon his kinsmen, who were the MacLeans of Duart, to aid him when he would be going against his son.

On the eve of the day that came before the day on which the men of the MacLeans were to do battle with the men of Loch Buy, Ewen, wishing to know the thing that was to be his fate, walked to a remote place, and there asked a witch as to the issue of the fray. Maybe he asked this thing of Doideag, who was only less powerful than God himself; for the people of Mull say 'God is stronger than Doideag, but Doideag is stronger than the MacLeans.' And the answer of the witch was this: 'If the woman who is your wife shall be giving you of the butter without the asking, the victory shall be with you.' But Ewen of the Little Head was the son of a moonless night. In the morning of the day that followed, he waited long, but no butter was set before him: then he rubbed one hand against the other and stamped with his feet, but still no sign was there of the *im* which is made from the milk of the cow. Then the wife of Ewen spoke these words in his ear: 'The kicker of the old shoe will not be leaving skin on palm!' Whereupon her man made answer: 'Neither shoe now nor speech will be moving the bad housewife.' After this Ewen said within himself, 'It is time to be steeping the withes,' so he let loose his hounds into the shed where the milk was, and then, without bite or sup, he went to the fight.

It was in Glen Caimn, near by Loch Buy, that the foemen met. It was here, too, that the little head of Ewen was severed from his body by the stroke of a broadsword. Thereafter a strange thing befell. The steed upon which Ewen was mounted took fright, and with the now headless rider raced wildly through the glen and up and down the precipitous mountain sides of Mull.

Madly the horse bounded onward, passing where heretofore the goat only had been able to find a footing, clearing at one leap chasms that no beast had ever faced.

MacLean succeeded to MacLean, MacDougall to MacDougall, and still *Eoghan a' chinn bhig*, Ewen of the Little Head, seated on his charger, was seen to scour the wild and desolate places in the island whenever evil threatened the head of the house of Loch Buy. And some say that the reason of this is that he fell fasting.

The islesmen of the West love the sea : they love too the hill-pastures, and the kye that wander there, and the shealing on the mountains which is their home in the time of summer. Many are the lullabies that the milkmaids of Mull, of Skye, of Arran, and of the other islands have chanted in the green valleys, or on the heather-crowned hills of their fair sea-girt homes. Many and sweet are the songs they have sung to Blarag, the brown star, or Ciarraig, the dusky-grey cow, or Riabhag, the brindled one, or Odhrag, the dun one, and to all the kye at the milking time. And has not the milking of the kye been a sweet thing to every daughter of the isles since Deirdré lived—Deirdré who was lovely and fair as the face of the first day's snow—even to our own time. And has not every daughter of the hills loved to croon the Gaelic songs, while the milk that is foaming and warm comes from the kye who turn their heads, and, breathing gently, gaze at the milker with their soft eyes, and listen contentedly to each note of the *fonn* which they have heard every morning and evening for many evenings and mornings :—

' O, my heifer, ho ! my gentle heifer,  
My heifer so full of heart, generous and kind,  
In the Name of the High King  
Take to thy calf.

That night the Herdsman was out,  
No shackle went on a cow,  
Nor ceased a low from a calf,  
Wailing the Herdsman of the flock.

Come, Mary Virgin, and milk the cow ;  
Come, Bridget, and encompass her,

Come, Colum Cille, the beneficent

And wind thine arms around my cow.

My lovely black cow, the pride of the shealing !

First cow of the byre, choicest mother of calves !

Wisps of straws round other cows of the town-land

But a shackle of silk on my heifer so loved.

Thou black cow ! mine own gentle black cow !

Ah sure, the same trouble is thine that is mine ;

Thou art grieving for thy beautiful first calf,

And I for mine only beloved son under the sea.'

It was because Morag of Mull loved her milch-cows as a mother loves her children that a sorrow came upon her. Mac Iain Ghiarr, albeit he was a sea-rover, was of the MacDonalds of Mingarry, which is in Ardnamurchan. The dark day of his father had come when Iain was young, and after this it was that his mother had married for the second time, and that not a man of the mainland, but a farmer of Mull. Now the cold wave which is death had covered her too, and her body had been put under the brown mould on the island which was the home of the man she had married after Iain's father died. This thing lay as a heavy weight upon Iain, for he wished his mother to sleep beside the Ghiarr who was his father. Therefore Iain painted a boat that he had on the one side black, and on the other side white. In this boat he crossed the water, which is the Sound of Mull, in the morning, and men said, 'It is a white boat that will be making for the island,' and in the lateness when he returned, men said, 'It is a black boat that will be leaving the shore for the mainland.' It was in the gloaming of a day mid-way in the yellow month that fair Morag was drawing the milk from her favourite cow, while she sang to it of its mother, and its father, and its father's father :—

'Ogha Ciarraig iar-ogh Duinneig,

Cha 'n fhaigh Mac Iain Ghiarr a' muil thu.'

The words of her song were in the ears of Mac Iain Ghiarr, and he made answer, albeit Morag did not hear :—

'A bhean ud thall ris an t-sior bhleoghann

Bheir mi 'n dubh 's an donn 's a shiar uat

'S dusan de na aighean ceud-laoigh.'

It was that very night that Iain mated the cruel act to his cruel words. In the morning of the next day, Morag searched long for the kye who had been to her as friends; but all she found was the *caiscin-nihd*, or breast-bit of each. By this she knew that further seeking would be in vain. That night, and for many a night thereafter, Morag wept in her heart. For a day and a year she roamed aimlessly about the hill-pastures, and around *Bol-airidh*, the Fold of the Shealing, but the end of this thing is not known to the people of Mull. The saying only remains, and that is ' *Taobh dubh us taobh ban a bh'air bata mhic Iain Ghiarr.*'

Variants of the Rune of the Seven Winds may be heard to this day in the Isle of Skye.\* 'The first four winds are the *Gaoth tuath* (the North Wind), *Gaoth 'n ear* (the East Wind), *Gaoth deas* (the South Wind), and *Gaoth 'niar* (the West Wind). The three others are the Breaths of the Grave, of the Depths of the Sea (or Oblivion), and of the Future.

## I.

' By the Voice in the torries  
When the pole-star breatheth :

By the Voice on the summits  
The dead feet know : †

By the soft wet cry  
When the Heat-star troubleth :

By the plaining and moaning  
Of the Sigh of the Rainbows :

By the four white winds of the world,  
Whose father the golden Sun is,

---

\* I am indebted to Miss Fiona Macleod for permission to include this rune, and the Rune of the Reading of the Spirit. The following account with which I conclude, is condensed from her article in last December's number of *Harper's Magazine*.

† The old Celtic custom was to bury the dead with their feet towards the East. It is said that the Wind of the Resurrection will blow from that quarter.



Whose mother the wheeling moon is,  
The North and the South and the East and the West :

By the four good winds of the world,  
That Man knoweth,  
That One dreadeth,  
That God blesseth—

*Be all well*

*On mountain and moorland and lea,  
On loch-face and lochan and river,  
On shore and shallow and sea !*

II.

By the Voice of the Hollow  
Where the worm dwelleth :

By the Voice of the Hollow  
Where the sea-wave stirs not :

By the Voice of the Hollow  
That Sun hath not seen yet :  
By the three dark winds of the world ;  
The chill dull breath of the Grave,  
The breath from the depths of the Sea,  
The breath of To-morrow :

By the white and dark winds of the world,  
The four and the three that are seven,  
That Man knoweth,  
That One dreadeth,  
That God blesseth—

*Be all well*

*On mountain and moorland and lea,  
On loch-face and lochan and river,  
On shore and shallow and sea !*

It was in Skye, too, that the woman, whom Miss Macleod calls Eilidh, spoke the Rune of the Reading of the Spirit. A black day it was when the man Sheumas MacEwan, who fared to and fro between Stornoway and Ardrossan, met Eilidh in a wild spot of the wild Cuchullins, known as the Loat o' Corry. The clouds hung heavy and dark on the hills ; and Sheumas had the gloom upon him, and the woman Eilidh had the sight. The dusk had fallen when Eilidh came up to Sheumas silently as a shadow.

She put the soles of her feet upon his feet; she folded his hands in her hands, and her eyes, in which burned a strange light, looked searchingly into his eyes. Then the woman said this thing:—

‘ By that which dwells within thee,	(the soul)
By the lamps that shine upon me,	(the eyes)
By the white light I see litten	
From the brain now sleeping stilly,	(the light on the brow)
By the silence in the hollows,	(the ears)
By the wind that slow subsideth,	(the slacking breath)
By the life-tide slowly ebbing,	
By the deith-tide slowly rising,	(the pulsing blood)
By the slowly waning warmth,	
By the chill that slowly groweth,	
By the dusk that slowly creepeth,	
By the darkness near thee,	
By the darkness round thee,	(swoon or trance)
By the darkness o’er thee—	
O’er thee, round thee, on thee—	
By the one that standeth	
At thy side and waiteth	(the soul)
Dumb and deaf and blindly,	
By the one that moveth,	
Bendeth, riseth, watcheth,	(the phantom)
By the dim Grave-Spell upon thee,	
By the Silence thou hast wedded. . . .	
May the way thy feet are treading,	
May the tangled lines now crookèd,	
Clear as moonlight lie before me !’	

The night that came after the hearing of the Rune of the Reading of the Spirit, Sheumas MacEwan did not so much as close his eyes. The next day passed, and he lived on. But his hour was pursuing him. The woman Eilidh had seen clearly that which should come about. No spell could save him now.

On the second night after the meeting of Sheumas and Eilidh, a man was seen leaping about the jagged rocks of the Storr. He leaped as a goat leaps, and weird sounds, like the moaning of the sea, came from his lips. Thereafter he beat the gaunt rocks with his clenched fists. No man could follow him where he went. . . . It was in the morning of the next day, a day of sunshine and peace on the isles, that the mangled body of

Sheumas MacEwan was found high up on the rock which is called the Needle Rock, wind-blown against the cliff like a dead bird.

FRANK RINDER.

---

ART. V.—GUSTAV FREYTAG.

IT cannot be said that contemporary German literature is much the poorer by the death of Gustav Freytag, for he had long ceased to take an active part in it, but Germany loses in him a writer whose name must always hold an honourable place upon the roll of her literary worthies. With Friedrich Spielhagen and Paul Heyse, Freytag completed the trio of what may be called the distinctively representative writers of modern German fiction. Freytag was considerably the oldest of the three, and in his writings seemed the predecessor rather than contemporary of the others. His best novel, *Soll und Haben*, and his finest play, *Die Journalisten*, both important, if not exactly epoch-making, landmarks in the literary history of the century, precede Heyse's and Spielhagen's best work by at least a decade. Without *Soll und Haben*, it is difficult to believe that Spielhagen could have written his *Problematische Naturen*, without *Die Journalisten* the popular pieces of the modern stage of the type cultivated by L'Arronge, Moser, and Blumenthal, would certainly have less claim to literary consideration than is actually the case. But if Freytag thus preceded his most celebrated brother-novelists, he also fell the sooner out of sympathy with the literary spirit of the age. Spielhagen's *Problematische Naturen*, for instance, is in many respects the novel of a past generation, yet Spielhagen throws himself heart and soul into the literary sympathies of the younger writers of to-day; Paul Heyse, too, shows a deep interest in modern literary movements, and in his most recent long novel, *Merlin*, and in several plays, *Wahrheit?* for example, we find him valiantly and successfully fighting the realistic spirit upon its own ground. Freytag, on

the other hand, had nothing but supercilious contempt for writers like Hauptmann and Sudermann, and made not the slightest attempt to understand the best literary production of the last decade. An estimate of his work and position in literature is thus a matter rather of literary history than contemporary criticism; for this reason, too, it is perhaps accompanied with less difficulty.

Freytag, like so many of the men who have left a mark upon their country's literature, came from a remote province. He was born in 1816, in the town of Kreuzberg, in Upper Silesia, where his father was physician and ultimately Bürgermeister. Philology was Freytag's chosen *fach* at the university; he devoted himself with especial ardour to the older history of his own language, and in the course of his studies had the benefit of two such masters as Hoffmann von Fallersleben, the poet-philologist, in Breslau, and the great Lachmann in Berlin. But Freytag was too much of a poet himself to be content with the mere dry bones of philology. In Berlin the theatre opened up a new world to him; he suddenly discovered the greatness of Shakespeare, and from that date the drama became one of his favourite and not least fruitful studies. In 1839 he was appointed *privat docent* in German Language and Literature in the University of Breslau, but after a few years, he grew weary of lecturing on purely literary and linguistic subjects and he came to loggerheads with the authorities by desiring to extend his programme into fields more akin to history. In disgust Freytag threw up his post and left the university. He was then in his thirtieth year, but had already laid the foundation for a literary career; in 1841 he had produced a historical comedy, *Kunz von der Rosen*, which met with considerable approbation in its day, even obtaining a prize in Berlin, but it failed to win any permanent footing upon the stage. To us it is only interesting now as affording in the hero a type of character which Freytag was later to immortalise in Conrad Bolz and Fritz von Fink. *Die Valentine*, produced in 1846, was hailed as a masterpiece, a fact that says but little for the condition of the German theatre in the middle of the century. The play is by no means without merit, but it seems

strange now to learn that it could ever have been regarded as a masterpiece in any sense of the word. Now-a-days *Die Valentine* is completely out of date and rarely played. Better in every respect was *Graf Waldemar*, written in the following year; time has also dealt unkindly with this piece, but it still enjoys a certain popularity in German theatres. The dialogue is so crisp and even brilliant that it could hardly fail to create some effect on the stage; but the entire atmosphere of the piece belongs, we feel, to a bygone day.

*Die Journalisten*, produced in 1853, eclipsed all Freytag's previous dramatic work. This play is one of the few bright spots in the history of German comedy. It was not merely the best German comedy since Lessing's *Minna*, but it is hardly an exaggeration to describe it as the best German comedy of its class that our century has produced. The fact at least remains that after more than forty years it enjoys as great popularity as ever; it is one of the established repertory-pieces of the German theatres. The plot, like that of all good comedies of manners, is slight. Provincial politics and provincial journalism form the background, and these, it need hardly be said, bear about as little semblance to latter-day German politics and journalism as the electioneering adventures in *Pickwick* resemble a modern English election. There is, in fact, something almost Dickensian in the style of Freytag's play, but without the English tendency to farce. Whatever *Die Journalisten* is, it is at least genuine comedy from first word to last; the element of farce is rigidly excluded. One might think that when so much in the play is necessarily old-fashioned, it would seriously interfere with its present-day popularity, but the charm of the piece lies outside the petty squabbles of provincial elections and rival newspapers; it is the delicate wit and charming lightness of touch that keep it alive; the atmosphere, too, is eminently sympathetic, and the dialogue bristles with 'good things.' Conrad Bolz, the young liberal journalist who carries all before him, is Freytag's one great creation, almost his only creation in the higher sense of that word, for even in his novels, Freytag displays no mastery of characterisation. His figures are too often types of national

character rather than living men and women, and there is always a tendency for purely typical figures to sink to the level of puppets. The hero of *Die Journalisten*, as we have already seen, has a prototype in Kunz von der Rosen, but the same character appears again and again in Freytag's books, notably in the person of Fink in *Soll and Haben*. But Conrad Bolz remains, to our thinking, the best example. With his combination of good-heartedness, wit and brilliancy—albeit one never forgets that he is a German—Bolz is one of the most charming figures in modern dramatic literature. It is a favourite rôle with all German actors of what in stage language is known as the *bon vivant* type, and a rôle which, in an experience of at least half-a-dozen different performances, we have never seen badly played. The popularity of the character is evident from the fact that in the pieces of the last forty years Bolz can boast of a long line of descendants—not all, we fear, very creditable—down to the *Veilchenfresser* so popular on the German stage at the present day.

There are some types in literature which seem to have in themselves the inherent power to rise, others as unfailingly sink. In the history of the German drama Schiller's *Don Carlos* is a prominent example of the former class; it marks the beginning of a great line of noble dramatic creations which down to the works of Grillparzer and Hebbel, form the backbone of the national theatre, whereas Lessing's *Minna von Barnhelm*, a greater dramatic masterpiece, brought nothing in its train that was even worthy of itself. For, reluctant as we may be to acknowledge it, Gutzkow is Lessing's real successor in the drama. Freytag's *Journalisten*, like Lessing's *Minna*, was of a type doomed to degenerate, and the least literary productions of the modern stage must be traced back to it. The modern literary comedy—we instance Grillparzer's *Weh' dem, der lügt*, and even Fulda's *Talisman*—is, properly speaking, not rooted in German literature at all.

Eleven years after the production of *Die Journalisten*, Freytag surprised his admirers by producing a drama completely opposed to anything he had yet attempted, *Die Fabier*. This is a Roman tragedy of the severest classical type and in verse.



Perhaps had Freytag written nothing else, *The Fabians* would have been accounted a success, for there is genuine dramatic power in the contrast of patricians and plebians which forms the background to the play, but the public were too much accustomed to him as the author of sparkling prose dialogue to have much patience with his blank verse; *The Fabians* is, in consequence, forgotten.

When Freytag left the University it was to settle as *litterateur* and journalist in Leipzig. He became one of the editors of the well-known *Grenzboten*, and this position he held until 1870. In Leipzig, too, he had the opportunity of renewing his acquaintance with a first-class theatre, and in Heinrich Laube found a friend who was one of the greatest theatre-directors of his time. These advantages were of especial significance for a theoretical work which he published in 1863—it appeared only the other day in English dress—*Die Technik des Dramas*. It is a solid, if somewhat limited treatise on the general laws of dramatic composition, but good books on dramaturgy are not so common, even in Germany, that we can afford to neglect this contribution of Freytag's to the subject. In these days when, under Ibsen's influence, the younger playwrights of Europe are widening the field of the drama and breaking down the old boundaries of dramatic composition, Freytag's point of view has necessarily become old-fashioned, but his book contains much conscientious reflection and common sense, and deserves to be turned to occasionally, if not as a handbook, at least as an antidote to the more extravagant theorising of our day.

To the world at large, however, Freytag's claims to fame rest upon his great novel *Soll und Haben* ('Debit and Credit.') What he achieved for the theatre with *The Journalists*, he achieved for the novel with *Debit and Credit*. The position of this work in the history of German fiction is best gathered from the motto, a few words by his colleague in the editorship of the *Grenzboten*, Julian Schmidt: 'The novel must seek the German people where they are at their best, namely, at their work.' *Soll und Haben* is a social novel and a novel with a purpose; it is an attempt to paint in attractive colours the

everyday life and work of the German people. The idea of making 'work' the subject of literary treatment did not, however, originate with Julian Schmidt. The credit of having directed the German novel to this new field belongs rather to W. H. Riehl, a writer who is still amongst us. In 1851 he published the first volume of his *Natural History of the German People*, a book which, it may be remembered, found an appreciative reviewer in George Eliot in the *Westminster Review* of 1856. In this work Riehl disclosed the poetic possibilities of the everyday life of the people and opened up a field for the novelist which had not hitherto been dreamt of in Germany. Freytag was the first to take advantage of it; his avowed aim in *Soll und Haben* was to depict the poetic side of German commercial life. He wrote a charming novel, and an interesting novel, but we doubt if he altogether succeeded in accomplishing his object. The abiding interest of *Soll und Haben* rests rather on the variety of its incident and character than in the faithful presentation of the uneventful life among the bales and boxes of a Hamburg warehouse; every reader feels more interest in the love and adventures of Fink and Lenore Rothsattel than in the hum-drum commercial element that surrounds the hero. While Freytag paints trade as a good honest occupation, he hardly conceals his stronger artistic sympathy with the less 'solid' life of the characters who are not so conscientiously immersed in the cares of business. Freytag, we feel, failed to demonstrate that a great novel can be written on motives drawn exclusively from the 'work' of a nation; his artistic instincts happily proved stronger than his theory.

In this country *Soll und Haben* has always, we believe, been the most popular and widely read of modern German novels. This is probably mostly due to the fact that we find in it so much of that lightness of touch, freedom from prolixity and blending of humour and seriousness which are so characteristic of our own best fiction. *Soll und Haben*, in fact, is the most English of German novels; although less an imitator of the English social novel than Spielhagen, Freytag really approaches nearer to our models in his work. We are apt, however, for this very reason, to form an exaggerated opinion

of the importance of *Soll und Haben* in German fiction. We are constantly forgetting that the greatness of foreign fiction is not necessarily dependent on the closeness with which it approaches our own ideals of novel-writing. In fact, the very reverse may often be the case, for surely it must be conceded that every nationality has a right to develop a national type of romance of its own. In the case of French literature the temptation to judge by English standards has never been great, for the gulf between English and French fiction is very wide; Balzac and Flaubert do not stand or fall by a comparison with our own masters of fiction, for the nature of their work precludes any such comparison. But in the case of the German novel it is different; either we expect on grounds of racial affinity a certain similarity between the works of German writers and the works of our own, or, recognising that the German novel owed in its earlier stages so much to English models, we resent any independent national development on its part. However that may be, the fact remains that we are still far from possessing a genuinely perspective view of German fiction, and that simply because it is so difficult for us to throw off national prejudices.

And such prejudices go far towards giving *Soll und Haben* an exaggeratedly high place in modern German fiction, while in point of fact, it is doubtful if it deserves even as high a place as Spielhagen's earlier works, *Problematische Naturen* or *In Reih' und Glied*, and it certainly cannot be compared with Heyse's finest work. It must never be forgotten that the real development of the German novel as a national type, begins with Wieland's *Agathon* and finds its first great masterpiece in *Wilhelm Meister*; that the royal line of national fiction in Germany takes us down, not as in England, through social novels of common life, but through the Romantic School to the *Maler Nolten* and *Grüne Heinrich* of our own day. Paul Heyse's *Kinder der Welt* and *Im Paradiese* are really nearer to this direct line than the works of Freytag, Auerbach, or Spielhagen. *Soll und Haben*, then, although one of the great German novels of the century, is by no means the greatest, and it is only epoch-making in so far as it heralded a class of *Tendenzromane*,

which rely for their interest on incidents taken from the ordinary life of the German citizen.

In his first novel Freytag had dealt with the conflict of the commercial class and the landed nobility, in *Die verlorene Handschrift* ('The Lost Manuscript'), his second essay in fiction, published in 1864, he opposed the world of scholarship to the court-life of a small German principality. Professor Werner, whose prototype was no other than Heyne of Göttingen, finds in the quest for a lost manuscript of Tacitus, his wife, Ilse; but he is by no means disposed to regard Ilse as a substitute for the manuscript; the search still engages his attention and, so pre-occupied is he with it, that he fails to see that the prince who so generously furthers his interests, is in love with his wife. Ilse, however, remains faithful to her professor, and he is ultimately consoled for the undiscovered manuscript by the birth of a child.

*The Lost Manuscript* is neither so ambitious nor successful a novel as its predecessor. The philological scholar, with his strength and his weakness is delicately portrayed, and Ilse is a charming specimen of the unsophisticated German maiden, but we miss the spontaneity of *Soll und Haben*; occasionally, indeed, Freytag seems writing for effect, and the humour is often forced and artificial. At his best, Freytag is a genuine realist, although not perhaps a realist in the Zolaesque sense of the word, but his realism often, like Zola's, errs on the side of giving exaggerated importance to inartistic detail. When it is a question of the uninteresting personages of everyday, and the uneventful life of home or office, Freytag is realistic to an excessive degree; he displays a morbid interest in the most trivial minutiae, but, unlike Zola, he is not consistent. For, as soon as his sympathies are kindled and his characters become really interesting to him, the realism is discarded and he soars into an impossible and unconvincing idealism; in the same way, his humour, when it is in any way pronounced, loses all touch with reality and becomes simply caricature.

Before his second novel was published, Freytag had begun the publication of another work of a different nature, his *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* ('Pictures from Germany's

Past'), which ultimately extended to no less than five volumes (1859-1867). His aim with this work was to afford a series of vivid historical pictures, demonstrating the continuity of German national life from the earliest times to the present. Although these 'Pictures' profess to be no connected history, they form one of the most fascinating introductions to history that has ever been written. It is a thoroughly popular work from first page to last—not a treatise by a Dryasdust for an audience of scholars, but a book written for the people by a man of genuine poetic instinct. To know Freytag only as a novelist and dramatist is only to know him half, for with these historical pictures he has won for himself as high a place in the ranks of historical writers. The *Bilder* are planned upon essentially democratic lines; to describe faithfully the life and social conditions of the people is Freytag's first object. We are disposed to think that he has succeeded best in the earlier volumes; in them he makes the German Middle Ages, with their pure, unadulterated mediævalism, live again before us, and the Great Charles, Luther, and other leaders of men stand out in living portraits which leave an indelible impression on the mind. To the foreign reader, unwilling to be overburdened with a multiplicity of detail, we know of no history of Germany that will prove itself half as attractive as these 'Picture's' of Freytag's.

This historical work was virtually a preliminary study for a still more ambitious literary undertaking, no less than a cycle of historical novels planned upon a magnificent scale. This cycle, entitled collectively *Die Ahnen* ('Our Forefathers'), was to trace in a series of historical romances the history of a German family from the earliest times to the present day. There seems to us, however, to be more of those qualities which will resist the tooth of time in the strictly historical 'Pictures' than in the novels which arose out of them. *Die Ahnen* reached only six volumes (1872-1880), but the original plan must have embraced a much more extensive series of stories. The first volume, *Ingo und Ingraban*, introduces us to German life in the fourth and eighth centuries, the second, *Das Nest der Zaunkönige* ('The Wrens' Nest'), centres round the Emperor Henry II. in



the beginning of the eleventh century; the third volume deals with the last period of the Hohenstaufen, beginning in 1226; and the scene of the fourth, *Markus König*, is laid in Thorn at the time of the Reformation, while the fifth, *Die Geschwister*, includes two stories, one affording pictures of the close of the Thirty Years' War, the other of the Age of Frederick the Great. The final volume, *Aus einer kleinen Stadt*, takes us down to the middle of the present century. The hero of this story, the last descendant of the race of Ingo, after having lived through the stormy days of 1848 as a student at the university, settles down in a provincial town as the editor of a liberal newspaper. One need be no German patriot to feel that there is somewhat of an anticlimax here; it seemed hardly worth while to trace a German family down through the centuries only to make a journalist of its last descendant. Were it not that irony was so remote from Freytag's temperament, we might be disposed to see in this conclusion a bold stroke of satire; but this is certainly not the case. Freytag, had, in fact, a remarkably lofty conception of the Fourth Estate, and in the middle of the century German journalism, hampered although it was, by bureaucratic supervision, took itself extremely seriously, and would have been insulted had it been even accredited with the 'smartness' which is the boast of every journalist who respects himself to-day. But without being suspected of Chauvinism, we might surely expect that Freytag would have allowed his hero to fight at Sedan and rejoice with a united Germany.

As a whole *Die Ahnen* is exceedingly unequal, and the impression it leaves upon the reader is decidedly unfavourable. Fine scenes there are, fine flashes of insight into character and motive, but they are few and far between. The individual novels stand far below the two novels of modern life upon which Freytag's fame rests. The earlier volumes of the series, where the poetic inspiration is most apparent, suffer unfortunately from an artificial archaism of style and an attempt to fill up gaps in tradition with philological theories; they suffer from the remoteness of the periods they describe, whereas in the latter volumes, where the materials were so much richer,



Freytag had too evidently grown weary of his work; each succeeding story shows a marked falling off upon its predecessor. Clearly Freytag had over-reached himself; he was not the man to write an historical novel, still less a cycle of historical novels. His temperament could not allow him to wander quietly, like Alexis, in the footsteps of Scott, imitating without stint; he was too modern and realistic for that. Nor, on the other hand, had he that clear insight into human character and motives that is more essential to the historical novelist than even to the 'psychological' delineator of modern life. The historical novel has in our day fallen into disrepute, not, as some would insist, because the *genre* is dead, but because its writers do not sufficiently recognise that it demands greater psychological power to make the men and women of past ages live again than the men and women of our own day. Freytag had sufficient mastery of the novelist's art to make a success of *Soll und Haben*, he had not enough of it to create a historical masterpiece.

Freytag's other works—an excellent biography, a volume on Luther, a book, not in the best of taste, on the Emperor Frederick (1889) and a series of autobiographical sketches—need not trouble us here; they do not affect his place in literature. Since the beginning of the eighties, in fact, Freytag dropped out of the German world of letters and ceased to be a factor of any weight in contemporary literature. He is pre-eminently a mid-century writer. It needs no gift of prophecy to say that his works will not pass down to a very late posterity—even now the younger critics of the day are disposed to pass him by with a shrug of the shoulders—but the author of *Soll und Haben* surely deserves an honourable niche in the Walhalla of German genius. All he has written is delightfully frank and clear, and he has probably done more than any other German writer to bring the middle classes within the sphere of the novelists' and the playwrights' art; there is, moreover, nothing morbid about him—surely no small commendation in these times. Between 1850 and 1870 he was beyond question the leading man of letters in Germany. His limitations, on the other hand, are great; his stock of charac-

ters was exceedingly small, and in matters of heart and soul, of suffering or passion, he often shows—it must be admitted—a strong vein of Philistinism. But we may safely say that the day is still distant when *The Journalists* will not be a favourite play upon the German stage and *Soll und Haben* will cease to be a book that everybody reads.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

ART. VI.—ST. ANDREWS, 1645-46.

*St. Andrews in 1645-46.* By D. R. KERR. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1895.

THIS essay is divided into three parts. In the historical introduction, a rapid survey is taken of the general state of Scotland, and Scottish affairs, from June 1643, to the middle of September 1645.

‘In the first days of 1645’—to quote from the essay—‘the affairs of Scotland, through a course of rapid and important events, had passed from a state of perplexing hesitancy into one of clear and determined issues. The Presbyterian party, the party undoubtedly in power, the party dominating Church and State, had ceased to look longer to the King for assistance in their anxious attempts to reconcile their spiritual loyalty with their loyalty temporal. In June, 1643, the Scottish Parliament, for the first time in the history of the country—if we except the precedent which its leaders claimed—met without the King’s commission. Its transactions at the outset had been nominally loyal, but as the course of events in the South proceeded, open hostility to the King had been declared by the levying of an army for the aid of the forces of the English Parliament. In the following year both Parliament and General Assembly had met with commission from the King, and in perfect harmony had worked for the protection of Presbyterian interests against the King’s hostility. Three Scottish armies were in the field. One was engaged in the suppression of the Irish Rebellion, another was in England under the veteran Earl of Leven, and a third was employed in the subjection of the Royalist districts at home. Compromise had been lost sight of, and all hopes were set upon a victorious campaign.’

The operations of Argyll, as leader of the Covenanters, and of Montrose, as leader of the Royalists, are referred to, in-

cluding the battles of Tibbermuir, Kilsyth, and Inverlochy, and terminating with the defeat of Montrose at Philiphaugh, by Lieutenant-General David Leslie, on the 13th September, 1645,—a defeat as disastrous to the Royalists of Scotland, as that at Naseby, in June of the same year, was to the Royalists in England.

In the second part of the essay, a sketch of the ecclesiastical, municipal, and ordinary life of the city of St. Andrews is given—a considerable portion being devoted to incidents connected with the University, which, Mr. Kerr justly states, 'was the chief glory of the city.' Reference is made to Rutherford, who was one of the most distinguished of the Professors, and to Robert Blair, minister of the first charge in the town, and 'after Rutherford, probably the most notable man connected with the city.' Rutherford was one of the Commissioners from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

'In many respects,' says Mr. Kerr, 'Rutherford was one of the most notable men of his time. His eloquence, courage, and sufferings for the cause of Presbyterianism had raised him to the position of a leader of the Church and, in some degree, of the people. His "*Lex Rex*," the treatise in which he attempted to state the true relations of a king and people, had become the recognised expression of the principles of the Scottish Presbyterians. As a preacher also he had become famous. His duties as professor being combined with those of an active minister, it is probable that he was known to the people of St. Andrews more as an eloquent preacher than as a teacher of theology. His preaching was passionate and vehement, evidently in keeping with his reputation as an uncompromising controversialist. With his earnestness and devotion he had the poet's sensuous imagination and subtle perception of analogies, and the gift of setting forth his strange conceits in language often beautiful and melodious. The peculiarity both of his ideas and language cannot, at times, be commended. This he would seem to have inherited from the generation of religious writers who preceded him. Still it is not necessary for the charitable to deny the reverence of these utterances, though they may not trust them on their own lips. His language, startling and repellent as it often is, was perfectly reverent as it came from him. Rutherford's intense, subjective nature was not the one to produce an effect for effect's sake. It may be remarked that many have condemned Rutherford's imagery as unseemly and even blasphemous who, it is more than probable, accepted the spiritual interpretation of the Song of Solomon. What has been condemned as the vice of Rutherford's religious writings was in many respects

the vice of his time, and is as marked in the saintly author of "The Temple" as in the Presbyterian divine. The life of Rutherford subsequent to 1647 was actively spent in the service of his Church. On his return from the Westminster Assembly of Divines he was raised to the Principalship of St. Mary's, which he retained till his death in 1662.'

In the third part of the essay, Mr. Kerr treats of the more important history of the city, viz., its connection with the events which were affecting the entire kingdom.

The troops raised in Fifeshire, suffered to such an extent, that exemption was granted by the Parliament to the Presbyteries of St. Andrews, Cupar, and Kirkcaldy from further levies, on account of the number, from these Presbyteries, which had been killed in the battles of Tibbermuir and Kilsyth. After the news of the defeat of Montrose at Philiphaugh, a service preparatory to a public thanksgiving was held at St. Andrews, on Sabbath, the 21st September. The thanksgiving for the great victory was offered up on the Sabbath following.

'For the common people of Scotland,' says Mr. Kerr, 'there were now times of quiet and respite from the terror of the sword. What engaged the thoughts of the country at this time was more the relations between England and Scotland. Both kingdoms were now in subjection to the arms of the English and Scottish Parliaments. It was a time for the squaring of accounts between the allies. Ever since the battle of Marston Moor differences had begun to arise between the English and Scottish parties as to the position of the Scots army in England; and now that the work of the English army was practically completed, the presence of the Scots soldiery became more and more a matter of dispute and irritation. At length, the matter became of so great importance, and so threatened the whole relations between the two kingdoms, that in July 1645, a commission of six from the English Lords and Commons was appointed to go to Scotland and treat with the Scots on the grave matters of the peace of the nation. The Scottish Parliament, in August, accordingly appointed a commission to meet the English Commissioners, and to treat with them.'

Having referred to the actings of the Commissioners, Mr. Kerr proceeds to a consideration of what took place in the Parliament which met at St. Andrews on the 20th of November, 1645. On that day, to quote from the essay, 'the representatives of the nobility and the commissioners of the shires and burghs of Scotland assembled in the hall of the New College under the Chancellorship of the Earl of Loudon.'

Interesting sketches, to which we refer the readers of the essay, are given of three of the most distinguished of the Parliamentary leaders—the Earl of Loudon, the Marquis of Argyll, and Sir Archibald Johnstone of Warriston. A detailed account is given of the trial of the prisoners taken at Philiphaugh. Reference is made to the proceedings of the Parliament relative to education, and to the vexed questions of the payment of the arrears due to the Scottish army, and its withdrawal from England.

In regard to the education of the people—

“An Act was passed for the erection of a school in every parish, with duly appointed and endowed schoolmasters. The schools were to be under the control of their particular Presbyteries in the matters of their foundation and appointment of masters. The burden of providing a good school-house and a stipend for the master of not less than a hundred and not more than two hundred merks was imposed upon the heritors of the parish. Stringent conditions were also imposed upon the heritors in order to insure the thorough maintenance of the school. It was enacted that the heritors should contribute towards the maintenance of the school proportionately, but should an heritor fail to pay his proportion for three terms, he would thereby entail the doubling of his proportion.

This Act was evidently passed in the expectation of more peaceful times; but that the Scottish politicians should have turned aside from the maze of diplomacy which they were at this time attempting to thread, to the matters of the people's education, must add honour to their memory, and vindicate their sympathy with the aspirations of the common people.

As to the other matters debated Mr. Ker observes :—

The questions of the arrears due to the Scottish army, and its withdrawal from England, were settled by the agreement of the Scots to accept £200,000 and public guarantee for as much more, and to withdraw their army from England. The occurrence of these transactions simultaneously with the committal of the King into the hands of the English Parliament forms the ground of the Royalist accusation against the Scots that they sold their King. But a short examination of the proceedings of the St. Andrews Treaty will show that the £200,000 was due to the Scots, and demanded by them long before the King had come to their army. At that time also the debt was acknowledged by the English and payment promised.

That the Royalist allegation is groundless, the following considerations may serve to show :—The occasion of the Civil War in England was the assumption, by the King, of power



which, if defensible under an *absolute* monarchy, was not legitimate under a *limited* monarchy, or any form of constitutional government. The King and the Parliament assumed, in consequence, an attitude of hostility to each other. In the early stages of the war it seemed as if the Royalist forces were to succeed in putting down what was termed, by them, the rebellion. Fairfax was defeated by Newcastle at Atherston Moor, and Sir William Waller was defeated at Lawnsdon Heath. Weymouth, Dorchester, Portland Castle, and Exeter were lost; and Bristol had been taken by Prince Rupert.

The Parliamentary party, and those who adhered to them, being thus in a critical position, were anxiously desirous of obtaining the assistance of the Scots, and sent Commissioners to Scotland to make arrangements for obtaining it. An International League and Covenant was entered into, and the English and Scotch bound themselves to stand by each other in defence of what they considered civil and religious liberties.

The Scots army was to come to the assistance of the English, and to be paid by the English £30,000 each month during their campaign in England.

In January, 1644, the Scots army crossed the Tweed. From the period of their entering England till after the Battle of Naseby, in June, 1645, which proved so disastrous to the King's forces, the most friendly relations subsisted between the two armies; but after that battle, in which the King's troops were hopelessly defeated, the English, finding themselves in a position to maintain their cause against the King without the assistance of the Scots, were eager to get quit of them. The Republican party in England were gaining strength; and knowing that the Scots, although opposed to the unconstitutional actings of the King, and resolutely determined to secure their civil and religious liberty, were nevertheless loyal to the Sovereign, they endeavoured to make their position in England as uncomfortable as possible; and, among other things, suspended the payment of the army for more than half a-year, with a view to making their return to Scotland not only desirable, but also necessary. 'Whilst they had need of them, they were careful to provide for them; but



now, they would let many months pass without sending them any money, or taking any care for their supply, or so much as affording them good words. One of two effects they thought this would produce—either that the soldiers would run away, or mutiny, and so the army disband or fall to pieces, or else live upon free quarters, and so, by oppressing the country, become odious to the people, and force them to rise against them.\* They were exposed, also, to many other vexatious annoyances and provocations.

In order to avoid being taken captive by Fairfax, the King escaped privately from Oxford, and unexpectedly came, in May, 1646, to the Scots army at Newcastle. He was neither invited, nor expected. His arrival was immediately intimated to both Houses of the English Parliament, with accompanying assurances, on the part of the Scots, that there was no treaty between them and the King, and that nothing would be done, or assented to, by them, inconsistent with the terms of the Solemn League and Covenant, to which both nations were parties. Every attempt was made by Henderson, as representing the Church; by the Earl of Leven, as representing the Army; and by Lord London, as representing the Estates, to induce the King to adhere to the Covenant, and thus come to an agreement with the Parliaments of England and Scotland, but in vain; and, finding that on no other terms could he count upon the aid of the Scots army, he proposed to the English Parliament that he might come to London, or any of his houses thereabout, with freedom, honour, and safety, that he might further treat upon the propositions of peace presented to him.

Within a fortnight after the King came to the Scots army, the English Parliament declared formally, by vote, that they had no further use for them; and, that after adjustment of their accounts, and payment of the arrears, they should withdraw from the kingdom.

Six weeks thereafter, early in August, they empowered their Commissioners to pay £200,000 before the removal of the

---

\* Hollis' *Memoirs* (Stevenson's *History*).

army, and £200,000 after its departure. Although not nearly the amount due, yet, in order to put an end to the annoyance to which they were being subjected, the terms were accepted on the 2nd September; and up to that date no negotiations had taken place in regard to the disposal of the King's person. That question had not yet been considered, and had no connection with the payment of the arrears which had long been previously due.

The King having refused to grant the propositions for peace which had been submitted to him, the House of Commons declared, by vote, 'that the person of the King shall be disposed of as both Houses of Parliament shall think fit. On September 24th the House of Lords concurred; and a Grand Committee of both Houses was appointed to confer, consult, and debate with the Commissioners of Scotland concerning the disposal of the person of the King.'\*

'In the Conference there were many and long debates for several days, the Houses of Parliament claiming the sole right and power in the disposal of the person of the King in England; and the Scottish Commissioners asserting that both kingdoms had an interest in the disposal of his person, whether he were in England or in Scotland, he being the King of both; but, at length, the Conference broke up without any agreement.'

On the 20th December the King again made known his desire, by letter to the English Parliament, to come to London, or neighbourhood, to treat anew in regard to the propositions for peace. This letter was received on the 25th: and, on the 31st December, the Houses resolved that Holmby House be appointed for the King to take up his abode, with such attendants as they shall appoint, and with due regard to the safety and preservation of his person. This vote, says Stevenson, both Houses of Parliament enclosed to his Majesty, and also to the Scottish Commissioners residing with his Majesty at Newcastle, who forthwith transmitted the same to the Parliament, then sitting in Scotland.

---

\* *Stevenson's History.*

Before coming to any final determination in the matter, the Parliament of Scotland resolved again to send Commissioners to his Majesty, earnestly and humbly to entreat him to agree to the propositions for peace previously submitted to him, assuring him that his assent to the propositions was the only condition which would enable them, consistently with the Solemn International Covenant engagement, to interfere effectually in his behalf. The King persisted in his refusal; and on the 16th January, 1647, 'the Estates of Parliament passed a declaration, wherein, having considered his Majesty's promises, when he came to the Scots army, to follow the advice of his Parliaments; his refusal to grant the propositions of both his kingdoms, notwithstanding the frequent addresses of this kingdom for that purpose; his Majesty's desire to be in London, or in some of his houses near to the Houses of Parliament; and the desire of the two Houses that he may come to Holmby House, promising the safety and preservation of his Royal person, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdom, according to the Covenant; they did declare their concurrence for his Majesty going to Holmby House, or some other of his houses in or about London, there to remain till he gave satisfaction to both kingdoms in the propositions of peace; and that, in the interim, there shall be no harm, prejudice, injury, or violence done to his Royal person; that there shall be no change of Government other than had been for three years preceding; and that his posterity shall be in no ways prejudiced in their lawful succession to the throne and government of these kingdoms.'

The interval occupied in fruitless negotiations, afforded time to the Republican party in England to perfect their designs against the King's person, which culminated in the tragic scene witnessed on the 30th January, 1649, when he was brought forth to execution, and his head fell on the scaffold erected in front of Whitehall Palace, the report of which unexpected atrocity sent a thrill of horror into the heart of the entire Scottish nation.

In order to mark their abhorrence of the deed, and their want of sympathy with its perpetrators, they resolved to pro-

claim the King's son as the legitimate heir to the throne, and their readiness, on condition of his adhering to the Covenant, to receive him as Charles II.

The Parliament of England had no right finally to dispose of the King's person without the consent of the Scottish Parliament, and could only do so by a flagrant breach of the treaty between the two kingdoms. The English Parliament would probably not have done so, had it rested with them. Before the army could find in the Parliament an instrument suited to its purpose, *Pride's Purge* required to be administered; and it was only after the army had succeeded in summarily and forcibly expelling from the Parliament those of its members who were not prepared obsequiously to favour the unconstitutional designs of the military leaders, that the execution of the King, despite the remonstrances and protests of the Scottish Parliament, took place. 'Upwards of forty of the Presbyterian members were cast into confinement; above one hundred and sixty were excluded from the House; and none were suffered to sit and deliberate but the most determined Sectarians, in all not exceeding sixty.' \*

The House of Lords refused to concur in the proposal to bring the King to trial as guilty of treason against the people of England; but the House of Commons which, after the depleting effects of *Pride's Purge* became the Rump Parliament, voted the concurrence of the Lords to be unnecessary, and became fitting tools of the military leaders.

The degraded Rump of the Long Parliament was permitted to retain its diminished power, but for a brief period, for when Cromwell afterwards found that its continued existence was an obstacle to his ulterior designs, he put an end to it in the most summary and contemptuous manner.

'Entering the House of Commons,' says Hetherington, 'he assailed the astonished members with a torrent of violent invectives, ordered the mace, "that bauble," to be taken out of the way, called in the military to eject the dismayed but struggling members, and having locked the door put the key in his pocket, and returned to Whitehall.'

---

\* Hetherington's *Westminster Assembly*.

So fell the English Parliament beneath the power of military usurpation; and at the same moment terminated the Westminster Assembly.

Every effort possible was made by Scotland to preserve the King's person. When the Scottish Commissioners in London became aware of the hostile measures proposed to be taken in reference to the King, they sent down an express to Edinburgh informing the Scottish Parliament of the summary procedure of the English army in secluding the members of the Parliament opposed to their designs, and of their intention to bring the King to trial. The Committee of the Estates sent up a strong remonstrance addressed to the honourable William Lenthall, Speaker of the English House of Commons, reminding them of the declarations made by the English Houses of Parliament, both to the King and to the kingdom of Scotland, that when the King was to go to England with consent of both kingdoms, and in accordance with his own desire repeatedly expressed, respect should be had to the safety and preservation of His Majesty's person.

'Wherefore,' they say, at the close of a strongly expressed appeal, 'we do expect that there shall be no proceeding against his person, which cannot but continue and increase the great distractions of these kingdoms, and involve us in many difficulties, miseries, and confusions; but that, by the free counsels of both Houses of Parliament of England, and with the advice and consent of the Parliament of Scotland (which is now sitting), such course may be taken in relation to him, as may be for the good and happiness of these kingdoms, both having an unquestionable interest therein.'

Finding that that protest of the Scottish Estates of Parliament failed to arrest or to delay the proceedings by which the King's life was threatened, their Commissioners in London, a fortnight afterwards, in name of the Scottish Parliament, addressed another solemn protest to the Speaker of the English House of Commons.

Having expressed their deep disappointment that their former protest had not put a stop to the proceedings against his Majesty's person, they conclude with the following statement:—



‘But we understand that after many members of the House of Commons have been imprisoned and secluded ; and also without and against the consent of the House of Peers, by a single act of yours alone, power is given to certain persons of your own number, of the army and some others, to proceed against his Majesty’s person : in order whereunto he was brought up on Saturday last, in the afternoon, before this new extraordinary court. Wherefore we do, in the name of the Parliament of Scotland, for their vindication from false aspersions and calumnies, declare, That though they are not satisfied with his Majesty’s concessions in the late treaty at Newport in the Isle of Wight, especially in the matters of religion, and are resolved not to crave his Majesty’s restitution to his government, before satisfaction be given by him to his kingdoms ; yet they do all unanimously with one voice (not one member excepted) disclaim the least knowledge of, or accession to, the late proceedings of the army here against his Majesty ; and sincerely profess, that it will be a great grief unto their hearts, and lie heavy upon their spirits, if they shall see their trusting of his Majesty’s person to the honourable Houses of the Parliament of England, to be made use of to his ruin ; so far contrary to the declared intentions of the kingdom of Scotland. And to the end it may be manifest to the world how much they abominate and detest so horrid a design against his Majesty’s person, we do, in the name of the Parliament and Kingdom of Scotland, hereby declare their dissent from the said proceedings, and the taking away of his Majesty’s life ; and protest, that as they are all together free from the same, so they may be free from all the evils, miseries, confusions, and calamities that may follow thereupon to these distracted kingdoms.’

Having made use of every means within their power to influence the English Parliament, without receiving any satisfaction, the Commissioners were directed by the Estates of the Parliament of Scotland, to make a last appeal to General Fairfax, the commander of the Parliamentary forces.

On the 29th of January, the day previous to the King’s execution, the appeal was sent to Fairfax. This last appeal, like those by which it was preceded, was fruitless. Nothing could induce the parliamentary and military leaders to pause. The death of the King could alone satisfy them ; therefore, on the subservient Rump Parliament in conjunction with the relentless leaders of the Parliamentary forces, the responsibility for that tragic deed must rest.

As for the arrears due to the Scottish army, although payment was long and inexcusably delayed, all questions relating to them were settled before the negotiations in reference to



the King's person had been entered on, a 1 months before these negotiations were concluded.

Had the King assented to the terms submitted to him by the Scottish Commissioners and been favourably impressed by the earnest and affectionate appeals addressed to him by the Chancellor the Earl of London, the Earl of Leven, and others, the entire nation would have put forth its strength on his behalf, even at the risk of a war with England; but his refusal tied up their hands, and rendered it impossible, without breach of solemnly plighted faith to England as a party to the Covenant, to interfere.

That both nations were right in insisting that the conditions which they proposed should be assented to as necessary to securing civil and religious liberty under constitutional, as opposed to personal irresponsible government, is clear, but difference of opinion will no doubt exist as to the wisdom of pressing upon the King the signing of the Covenant, after his repeated refusals on the alleged ground of conscientious scruples relative to his coronation oath.

The language employed in some portions of that document, is not such as would be made use of now; but it ought to be remembered that the laws of toleration were not understood then as now. Intolerance was the vice of the age. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents were all at fault in regard to it; and, in judging them, we ought to do so on the principle, adopted by all fair-minded historians, that allowance must be made for the opinions prevalent in the age in which they lived and acted.

It ought, also, to be remembered that the Covenant bound those who adhered to it to conserve and defend the legitimate right of the Sovereign, as well as to secure and defend the liberties of the subject. The principles contended for went down to the roots of constitutional government, and involved the very existence of civil and religious liberty.

What made the question of toleration more difficult was the fact that the extreme section of the Sectaries were in favour of toleration being extended to all, however prejudicial to the best interests of society their principles and practices might

be, such as the Levellers and Fifth Monarchy men, who held views subversive of all rule and order, and destructive of security to person and to property. To that 'boundless toleration,' as they called it, the Presbyterians both in England and in Scotland were opposed, and the recoil from the anarchical and socialistic views of the Sectaries, unhappily led them to take a view of toleration in general, greatly to be regretted, and which it would be foolish either to adopt or defend.

As far however as the leading members of the Westminster Assembly were concerned, they were on the way to a right understanding of the doctrine of toleration, for the men who framed and left on record the noble declaration: 'God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship,' could not fail ultimately, if not themselves, at least their successors who entered into their labours, to attain to right views regarding it.

The Scottish leaders in that Assembly were men of great ability. The men who, to say the least, could hold their own with the learned Selden, and in reply to his elaborate and carefully got up pleadings with their recondite references, take up point after point and dispose of them, could be no ordinary men. They were men whose intellectual stature would dwarf that of many of their detractors. They had no sympathy with the English republican sectaries. They were loyal to the throne; and not only so, but it is evident that several of them, as the Earl of Loudon, Henderson, and Blair, had a personal affection for the King, and would have done anything to promote his interests short of putting into abeyance strong conscientious convictions which they felt they dared not sacrifice.

They were not behind their age. They were men of varied acquirements, 'of immense reading both patristic and classical.' Indeed it would be difficult—as was stated by the late Lord Moncrieff many years since—to point to any work of the same period by any English jurist, in which the principles of

constitutional government are more clearly laid down, and more ably defended than by Rutherford in his *Lex Rex*, and, we may add, by Buchanan, at a still earlier period, in his *De jure Regni apud Scotos*.

'The chief English writers on these subjects of that day were Algernon Sydney, Harrington, and Milton. Of these, Sydney's work, which was not published until after his death, but was written some years after Rutherford's, follows almost exactly the course of reasoning adopted by the latter.

Harrington's *Oceana*, also later than Rutherford's, is a republican work, which Rutherford's is not; nor does Milton, in his treatise *On the Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, or his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano*, attain so clearly the constitutional view which the work in question so lucidly illustrates.'—(Lord Moncrieff).

From the numerous authorities quoted, and the varied sources of information referred to, it is evident that Mr. Kerr's Essay is the fruit of praiseworthy research. He is still young, only on the threshold of public life, and we hope that he may long continue to prosecute historical studies.

R. WILLIAMSON.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE 'SONG TO AEGIR.'\*

Hail, Aegir, Lord of Billows,  
 Whom Neck and Nix obey!  
 To thee, in morn's red dawning,  
 The host of heroes pray.  
 We sail to dread encounter:  
 Lead us o'er surf and strand,  
 Through storms and crags and breakers,  
 Into our foeman's land.  
 Should water-sprites us threaten,  
 Or if our bucklers fail,  
 Before thy lightning glances  
 Make thou our foemen quail!  
 As Frithjof on *Ellida*  
 Crossed safely o'er the sea,  
 On this our Dragon shield us,  
 Thy sons who call on thee.

---

\* Translated by Professor Max Müller.

When hauberk rings on hauberk  
 In battle's furious chase,  
 And when the dread Valkyries  
 Our stricken foes embrace,  
 Then may our song go sounding  
 Like storm-blast out to sea,  
 With dash of swords and bucklers,  
 Thou mighty Lord, to thee !

**T**HERE were great searchings of the mind in England, even among highly cultivated persons, when a few months ago the 'Song to Aegir,' by William II., was first brought into notoriety at a London concert. Though it had been sung, some time before, all over Germany—where not a few parents have of late had their boys christened 'Aegir,' and where quite recently a warship has also received that name—people in this country were rather puzzled. 'Who was this Lord of the Billows, whom Neck and Nix obey ?' they would ask in despair.

Yet, to this very day, the old Norse sea-god who was once so called, has left his clear trace on an English river. Thomas Carlyle once stated this fact ; and Carlyle's writings ought to be pretty well known by this time. In his essays on 'Heroes and Hero-Worship,' speaking of the bygone Teutonic system of belief, and of the ideas and the natural phenomena which are symbolised by its deities, he says :—

'Of the other Gods or Jötun's (Giants) I will mention only, for etymology's sake, that Sea-tempest is the Jötun Aegir, a very dangerous Jötun. And now to this day, on our river Trent, as I learn, the Nottingham bargemen, when the river is in a certain flooded state (a kind of backwater or eddying swirl it has, very dangerous to them), call it *Eager*. They cry out : "Have a care ! there is the *Eager* coming !" Curious, that word surviving, like the peak of a submerged world. The oldest Nottingham bargemen had believed in the God *Aegir*.'

The bargemen on the Ouse (Yorkshire), I am told, have the same expression as those at Nottingham.

So the disturbing action of a sea-wave on English rivers is still described, though unknown to those who use the word, under the name of an ancient Germanic deity, or giant-ruler of the tumultuous deep. 'Eagor,' with the Anglo-Saxons, was one of

the words for the sea. Aegir, or Oegir—as the more correct form is—was the representation of the terrible aspect of the storm-swept main. To him, the forebears of the English race once prayed for protection and mercy against dread perils. But it is strange how little the ancient mythology or religion of the Teutons—that ‘grand and savage faith of mightiest power,’ as Southey has it—the creed of the Jutes, the Angles, the Saxons, the Frisians, and other German tribes who made Britain into an England, the old creed of the Northmen too, who held sway on the western coast of Scotland, in the so-called ‘Kingdom of the Isles,’ down to the thirteenth century, and in Ireland for several hundred years, is at present known among the mass of educated Englishmen, especially in the southern part of the country.

Years ago, when giving lectures on this subject at Literary and Philosophical Institutions in various towns, I found that in North England there was, at any rate, more knowledge diffused about it than in those parts where the Norman-French Conquest of 1066 had made its first and its deepest imprint. I am glad to say, though, that the interest in the lofty, poetical, in many respects even charming system of Nature-worship of our doughty common forefathers—which not only excels in grim strength, but has also many attractive features of winsomeness—is rapidly reviving now. Oegir’s name and character, however, still require some explanation for the public.

In Germany itself, where the chief traits of the Wodan or Odin creed are universally known, and where of late several war-vessels have been ‘christened’ with the names of our ancient heathen deities, the general public were at first a little startled by the Hymn to Aegir. No doubt a number of fathers of families—as before mentioned—hastened, in their excess of loyalty, to give the name of ‘Aegir’ to their recently born boys. The question for them was only, whether such an appellation would be valid in law; and the Emperor’s Government has, therefore, been asked for a decision by several conscience-troubled parents. But the nature of the old gigantic Sea-god was little understood when William II. first led him on the stage of publicity. Even now, after there have been many articles about him in the Press, I have not seen in any journal an allusion to

the fact of Aegir's name lingering in that of a German river—namely, in the Eider, which runs across Schleswig-Holstein, a country from which the Emperor took his bride.

Of yore, that river's name was Egdora or Aegidora.\* In old Norse geographical and other documents it is called Oegis-dyr; that is, Door or Gate of Oegir—in other words, of the sea. Since Schleswig-Holstein has been fully re-united with the Fatherland, a ship canal, opened last summer, has been built for large vessels, connecting the German Ocean with the Baltic, so as to avoid the dangerous circuit round the Skager Rack and the Kattegat, a terribly wreck-strewn part of the northern sea. Thence the name of the Eider as the easy 'Door of the Sea' is now becoming twice apposite.

Here it may at once be mentioned that Oegir, in Scandinavian mythology, was said to have a dwelling in Hlesey, the present Lässöe (this word is only a slight transformation of Hlesey, meaning Hler's island) in the Kattegat. We may safely conclude from this statement that Oegir once had a sanctuary there. It was a very proper place for the God of the Sea-Storms, considering the dangers of the navigation through that northern Strait. Hler was one of the names of Oegir, under which he was known to the Giant-world kindred to him. Hler means the Concealer; that is, the wave which hides many things. It was a custom among Germanic deities to have many aliases. All-father Odin had more than fifty of them attributed to him.

The word 'Oegir' explains itself as 'Terror.' To aboriginal races, the wide expanse of the sea, with its tumultuous waves, gave rise to feelings of fear and awe; so much so that the root from which the Latin and German words *mare* and *Meer* (old English: *mere*) are derived, is the same as that from which *mors*, death, comes. As Grimm, the great authority, points out, Oegir's name has close etymological contact with that of the Greek Okeanos, the all-encircling Ocean.

For my part I hold it to be possible, nay, rather probable, that the Greek word is derived from the Scandinavian one; for in Homer (*Odyssey*, xi.) we hear that the great world-stream

---

\* See Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie*.



Okeanos is near the northern land of the Kimmerians, where it enters the sea. There, also, the Hellenic poet places the entrance to the Under-world with its wretched shades. In the preceding song of the *Odyssey* we come upon the remarkable description of a country of the Midnight Sun, with narrow bays, or *ffjords*, where a tall, gigantic race dwells, and where, as there is light all night, 'a sleepless man might earn a twofold wage.' We hear of an enormous stag—a reindeer, as it were. There is also a vague allusion to an island far out in the endless flood of the sea, where smoke rises in the middle, as if the poet had a dim notion of that *ultima Thule*, Iceland, with its geysers and volcanoes.

It has been proved from the finds at Mykenê that there has been an amber-trade from the North to the South in pre-historic times. I believe it can be clearly shown also that the Greek tale of the Heliades, which is connected with the origin of amber, must have been spread from the North to the South, and that the river Radanus—a confluent of the Vistula near the Baltic, where amber so plentifully came from—was originally in the tale about the weeping daughters of the Sun, whose tears crystallized into elektron, or amber. Now, considering all this, it could scarcely be wondered at, that tales about the high North should have spread towards the South, tales of which the Homeric description would be a dim and distant echo, and that a northern myth about Oegir's domain should have given rise to the Okeanos name.

In the Edda we hear of Ran as the wife of the terrible Norse Sea-god. Her name means 'the Robber;' it describes the destructive character of the sea. She has nine daughters, whose names all typify the various aspects of the billows. In the 'Frithjof-Saga,' the hero, when in peril of life on the raging sea, exclaims:—

Sweeter were the kisses  
Of Ingborg, in the grove,  
Than here to taste in tempest  
High sprinkled, briny foam. . .

The 'Frithjof-Saga' of Bishop Tegnér, which deals with the Norse sea-rover's love-story, then goes on:—

*The 'Song to Aegir.'*

Whirling cold and fast,  
 Snow-wreaths fill the sail ;  
 Over deck and mast  
 Patters heavy hail.  
 The very stern they see no more,  
 So thick is darkness spread ;  
 As gloom and horror hover o'er  
 The Chamber of the Dead.

And Frithjof thus urges his men :—

For us, in bed of ocean,  
 Azure pillows Ran prepares.  
 On thy pillow, Ingborg,  
 Thou thinkest upon me.  
 Higher ply, my comrades,  
*Ellida's* sturdy oars ;  
 Good ship, heaven-fashioned,  
 Bear us on an hour !\*

Here we have a portraiture of the wild, untamed forces of Nature, as represented by Oegir and Ran, who are of the Titanic or Thursar race.

There was, however, another Norse sea-god, Niörd, a more benevolent, tutelary deity, a fisherman's patron, an appeal to whom was apt to bring in wealth. He rules closer to the shore, where navigation and fishing are more easy. Originally Niörd belonged to the divine Vana race, which in olden times was at war with the Asa gods. But after a compromise, Niörd, with his son Freyr, a God of Peace, Fertility, and Love, and his daughter Freyja, the Germanic Venus, was received as a hostage into Asgard, the heavenly abode of the circle of deities, of whom Odin was the supreme ruler:

In sailor's fashion, Niörd was a much-married god. There is good ground for believing that in long bygone Vanic times, when marriage was still allowed between brother and sister—even as among Greek gods—Niörd had for his consort that Nerthus (formerly misread 'Hertha'), who, according to Tacitus, was worshipped by a number of German tribes near the sea, from whom, historically speaking, the English have mainly sprung. But after the Asa gods had been triumphant, though only by a fluke, and

---

\* The 'Frithjof-Saga,' translated by the Rev. W. L. Blackley.

a compromise had been effected with the Vana deities, the Aphroditæan custom of wedlock between brother and sister was no longer tolerated.

This myth about the divine Asa and Vana race in all probability refers to some historical event, namely, to a hostile encounter between tribes of a higher and a lower state of civilisation; the former remaining finally victorious.

Of Oegir, who had a home, or sanctuary, on an island in the Kattegat, we hear in the Norse Scripture, the Edda, that he generally dwelt in a palace below the sea, 'where light is shed as from shining gold.' Two servants of his are called Funafengr and Eldir, meaning the Captor of Fire and the Kindler of Flames. It is curious to observe how much the ideas of Water and Fire are connected in the thoughts of early races. A mass of myths might be quoted to that effect. The darting out of the lightning from the Cloud-Sea—for as such the rain-giving sky was conceived—forms, indeed, an easy connecting link both for the more ignorant onlooker and for the scientific enquirer.

The combination of water and fire in the phosphorescence of the sea is another fact which must have struck the fancy of myth-making races. Of late, this brilliancy of the brine has been explained as arising, in an agitated sea, from a process of part-combustion in minute jelly-like animalculæ. With early nations the golden fire-glow of the vasty deep may easily have led to the notion of its being the reflex of a submarine divine palace in which golden treasures are hoarded. Hence Poseidon and Amphitrite also dwell in a luminous, glistening palace of gold. At Aigai the Greek sea-god had even golden horses; he carried a golden whip; and he was clad in gold. In the same way a golden palace, at the bottom of the sea, was assigned to Triton, the son of Poseidon, who is but a rejuvenated Okeanos.

Of Grendel, the monstrous water-giant of the Anglo-Saxon epic 'Beowulf,' it was said that he dwelt in an abysmal hall, dimly lit by the golden treasures gathered below the sea. 'In the flood there is fire,' says the poem. Grendel is the Grinder. He and his mother, the primæval Sea-Woman, the Gnashing Sea-Wolf (*merevif, brimvylf*), are destructive demons. They represent the grinding, gnashing waves which in spring devastate

the flat shores of the North Sea, where within historical times Frisian islands have gone down before the howling storm-flood.

Now, may we not assume that the phosphorescence of the waves, which is often to be seen in such splendid colour on the billow-crests of the German Ocean, gave rise among our forefathers, as amongst the Greeks, to the idea of a gold-lit, gold-hoarding hall in the depths of the sea?

It was in Oegir's submarine palace that Loki, the northern Mephisto-God,—otherwise described as rather elegant and as a confidant of the female deities—created, by his evil tongue, that tremendous row which is so dramatically described in the Eddic lay, called the 'Banquet of Oegir.' All the evil deeds, all the secret weaknesses of gods and goddesses, were there brought out by him. These revelations, or insults, reached to such a pitch that when the God of Thunder at last appeared with his crushing hammer, Loki had to effect a retreat, which he did by jumping into the water in the shape of a salmon, but was captured, bound, and chained to a rock.

Here, however, it is but fair to mention that, in all likelihood, this Eddic poem contains a somewhat later satire upon the dis-established Norse Gods, and that it must, therefore, be read with a degree of caution.

Of Oegir, it is further told that when he made a journey to the heavenly Asgard, he sat, as a table-neighbour, next to Bragi. Bragi was the God of the Skaldic Art and of Eloquence, and his wife, Idun, kept the Celestials in youthfulness and immortality by her rejuvenating apples, at least, until Ragnarök, the Doom of the Gods, when some of them had to vanish. We hear of curious conversations between Oegir and Bragi, the sea-god showing much interest in the ancient history of the Aesir and in the origin of poetry. That must have occurred during a calm of the turbulent sea, when the terrible 'Ancient Mariner' had his moments of unbending and of leisure.

Now, a stranger account than the one which Bragi gave to Oegir as to the origin of poetry it would be difficult to invent. It must be read in the 'Bragaroedur,' that is, the 'Discourses of Bragi.' 'The Skaldic Art is called there 'Kwasir's Blood' or the 'Dwarf's Drink'; and Bragi's strange explanation is quite in

keeping with the habits of the Norse God of Poetry, who in the Edda is characterised as being rather over-fond of the cup. But who knows whether the tuneful, bardic husband of Idun was not himself 'half-seas over' when he gave that bibulous account to the Titanic ruler of the waves?

I will only add that, considering the table comradeship which seems to have existed between Bragi and Oegir, the German Emperor's poetical appeal to the dread sea-god, that he would shield the band of heroes, who are sailing in their Dragon ship, against the destructive designs of the Neck and other water-sprites, is doubly in order.

But what about the declaration of the Imperial poet-composer that the proceeds of his Ode are to be devoted to a Memorial Church in remembrance of the late Kaiser William I.? Why, if the grand old Neptune of the Northmen hears of such an intention in his gold-like palace below the sea, may he not, in his heathen hot temper, stir up a fresh tumult of waves with a *quos ego*, or rather a *quem ego*?

In the Emperor's song, Oegir is appealed to for aid against the dangers threatening from the Neck. In Teutonic mythology, there is a vast world of fanciful creation, in which Necks, Nixes, Nickers, Nöckens, as well as some animal-shaped water-spirits, like the Scotch Kelpie, or the Icelandic Nuggle (whose name is etymologically akin to them), appear in a hundred forms. All Germany was once filled with such tales. Even now they are told in some out-of-the-way places. There are, in still current folk-lore, bewitching fays of the flood, with truly Teutonic traits: yellow or golden locks and water-blue eyes, which, however, are sometimes said to be protruding and gruesome. But as water possesses, not only beneficent and attractive, but also pernicious, terrifying, destructive forces, the myth, of course, changes in the invention of its forms. Thus the Necks and the Nixes are alternately enchanting and cruel.

Like the kindred fancies of other ancient races, Germanic mythology saw, in water, the origin of all things; thus coming near to the ideas of some modern scientific explorers. Not less characteristic are the nocturnal water-lays and songs of the beautiful Undines who are said to lure youths into rivers and

lakes. These lakes play a large part in Germanic folk-lore, which has a great deal to tell about the sounds and songs that rise from the water.

It speaks for the musical aptitude of the Teutonic tribes that they recognised the melodic voice of well, brook, and stream; that they heard, in the confused roar of the waterfall, a law of harmonic strains; that in the grim raging of the flood they perceived that internal symmetrical movement of the sound-waves, which is now scientifically well proved. Their ear was not closed to the Elfin Song of Nature. In the fascinating Nix lays, in the magic harp-playing of the Swedish Ström Karl (the Strong Man of the Stream), they unconsciously embodied deep impressions made upon them by cosmic forces, of which, according to the state of their knowledge, they—or at least the mass of the people—could only render a fantastical account by means of a myth.

All this shows that the poetical conceptions of our fore-elders, which yet linger in folk-lore, are not simply to be rejected as superstitious. They merit being inquired into as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the thoughts of bygone generations, whose blood still courses in our veins, and whose ideas and speech are a living power to this day.

As to the 'Song of Aegir,' it may have its use. The generality of well-to-do persons being fond of remaining in the fashion, and mostly looking, with a kind of subserviency, to the example set by potent rulers, perhaps this Imperial production will give a new stimulus, among a larger class of people, to that study of the ancient Germanic creed, which I am glad to say has of late been visibly on the increase also in England.

KARL BLIND.

---



## ART. VIII.—BAGPIPE MUSIC.

A HIGHLAND piper, when asked to play, will almost invariably begin with some energetic quick step, and follow this with a lively strathspey and reel. He does this because he knows that music of the martial and bright order is expected of him. His bagpipe is a very old instrument, and, in the early days of its existence, dance music was apparently unknown. The Gaelic name for pipe music is *piobaireachd*, now commonly shortened and Anglicised into *pibroch*, and *pibroch* proper was the early music of the Highland pipe. Hence it follows that, down to the present day, the word *pibroch* does not signify marches, strathspeys and reels, but the old classic type of music exemplified in laments, salutes, and warnings. The precise origin of our national instrument will probably ever remain obscure. We know that the ancient Greeks and Normans possessed bagpipes, and that many of the nations with whom they came in contact also played upon this form of instrument. But we cannot say that the pipes used in Italy, Turkey, Egypt, or Scotland have sprung from those ancient pipes, any more than we can prove that the people of each country invented an instrument of this type for themselves.

The *pifferari* of Italy are occasionally seen in our streets with their ungainly monotonous instrument, but the pipes of Turkey and Upper Egypt, which are very much alike, are practically unknown. This type may be described as follows :—The bag is made of pliant kid skin and is almost twice the size of that used in Scotland. It remains uncovered, the holes made by the amputation of the legs and neck of the kid being gathered up and tied. There are no drones of any sort, but a short blow-pipe provided with a valve, to prevent the recoil of the breath, is inserted in the familiar manner. The part which we must call the ‘chanter’ for want of a better name, *i.e.*, the part in which the fingering holes are situated, is peculiar. Two canes, each about half a foot long, are lashed firmly together and secured with pitch. They project from a single ‘stock’ of olive wood to which the bag is

tied. Each cane has five holes, placed at equal intervals, so that the two canes being parallel, the holes appear in couples and are fingered together. To the lower end of this twin 'chanter,' two cut goat horns are attached, which bend upwards and appear to be a primitive attempt at the bell mouth, seen in more modern wind instruments. The stock reminds one of the narrow circular pulley of a spinning wheel, having a flattened disc with a groove running round its periphery. A reed is provided for each cane, and these project freely into the cavity of the bag. The reeds themselves are exactly the old fashioned tongued articles still used for the drones of our Highland pipes; a hollow reed cut off at a joint or node and therefore closed at one end, the wind being forced to pass through the slit which forms the tongue. In place of our tartan streamers there are a number of long brown tasseled cords of camel's hair attached to the horned mouths of the chanter. Some simple ringed decoration is also noticeable on the blow-pipe.

Before bagpipe music was written in the ordinary notation, a special system of saying or chanting symbols was in use, so that airs could more easily be handed on from one to another. This was termed the *canntaireachd*. It is not generally realized that the pibrochs of the MacCrummens and MacArthurs of Skye, and the Campbells of Lorn, were all originally learnt and circulated by means of this system. Not till about 1830 was pibroch music written as we now have it. The modern sol-fa notation is a very similar method adapted for the human voice. Only one collection of pibrochs, in *canntaireachd* language, appears ever to have been published. This book contained twenty airs obtained from one of the MacCrummens by a Capt. Neil Macleod of Gesto, it was published by Lawrie & Co., Edinburgh, in 1828. A description of it was prepared in pamphlet form by J. F. Campbell in 1880 (Glasgow, Archibald Sinclair, 62 Argyle Street). This writer has satisfied himself that three distinct systems of writing *canntaireachd* were common amongst pipers, in different parts of the country, as lately as sixty or seventy years ago. This old pipe language died a natural death with the publication of works, in the ordinary notation, by Angus Mackay, Ross, and others. Now, the taste of the most fastidious piper

may be suited from the large collections of pibrochs, marches, strathspeys, reels and jigs, published by David Glen & Gunn.

The compass of the Scotch instrument is nine notes, usually represented on the treble clef as including the notes from G to high A. The key note of the chanter is E, and to this the three drones are tuned, two in unison as tenors, one an octave lower as bass. All who are at all familiar with pipe playing must have remarked to what an extent sudden leaps occur, and how rarely it happens that anything like a true scale is found. In all very old pipe airs this is especially the case. The characteristic feature of the music, and the subtle effect of it lies largely in the fact that jumps instead of runs constantly seem to break up the normal rhythm, the leading notes of the melody being joined together by passing notes, grace notes, or warblers, in such a manner as to relieve the discord which would otherwise be apt to occur through the absence of the elements of the true scale, the semitones. The resting or sustained notes of pibrochs are practically those which may be found on the piano by playing only on the black keys, ascending the scale from say D flat for six other notes. The airs of old pibrochs such as MacCrimmon's Lament, Mackintosh's Lament, Mackay's Banner, may readily be played on the notes indicated. The use of complicated grace notes is now considered necessary in first class piping, and no doubt the general effect of 'heavy fingering' has been to put more solidity and tone into the playing.

In very early days, however, grace notes seem to have been introduced more on account of their use than from a desire to adorn or elaborate the composition. The original use of grace notes can be easily conceived when it is remembered that the construction of the instrument permits of no pausing in the melody, and that therefore, to separate two or more notes of the same pitch, it is necessary to accent the commencement of each note with a 'cut'; leave out the cut and the effect is similar to that produced on an organ if an attempt is made to play three notes in succession without lifting the finger. Such simple cutting would soon become elaborated, certain combinations of cuts being found particularly effective in certain places, and in this way the complicated 'warblers' of modern music would result.

Moreover it is certainly true that the greater the number of warblers, so the slightly discordant intervals are more frequently resolved, and any strain on the ear of the listener becomes less. In this connection also, the drones are most useful in assisting the airs at the most trying points and in producing the minor effect. For this reason therefore the drones are of greatest use during the playing of slow pibroch where larger intervals occur than in any other form of pipe music. In pibroch also, as every piper knows, the presence of an inaccurately tuned drone is much more quickly recognised. Hence it happens that the *deachan gleus* or prelude for tuning the pipe, always partakes of the pibroch character.

Marches, strathspeys, and reels are so well known that their characteristics need not be mentioned. The music of the pibroch, on the other hand, is but little understood by many, and on this account is less appreciated than would be the case if its real value were known. To one whose ear is unaccustomed to the strains of the pipes, the march may be intelligible, but a pibroch seems merely a discordant collection of confusing sounds redeemed by neither rhythm nor harmony. The reason for this seems to be that, compared to music of the familiar, perhaps we might even say more civilized type, the resting notes of the air occur at curious places and persistently prevent the establishment of the expected tune. The idea of having three constant notes continually droning seems also to be fatal to any melody. I have already attempted to show the real value of the drones; should my explanation have proved insufficient I would now recommend that a simple experimental test be applied. Let a piper be asked to stop his drones one after the other and let the listener test the effect upon his own ears. I venture to promise that all three drones will soon be set going again. If the bass drone be left out, the listener will hear the pipe as it sounded before Prince Charlie's time, but still he will agree that the boom of the muckle drone is a great acquisition. After some experience, as the ear becomes used to the curious scale a strange interest is awakened. It may be likened to the revisiting of an old and romantic country, in which the explorer walks by wild mountain torrent and wind swept heather, a country peopled by a bold and fearless race of

kilted warriors. He hears the warning pipe sound the approach of the invading foe to rouse the clans to arms. Fierce and sudden is the attack, and hoarse and loud are the shouts of the slayers. They glory in bloodshed, and cold and cruel is the mocking hand of their mercy. Or he wanders far by the still and lonely loch, where the gathering shadows shroud the lofty hills, and the solitary heron, with startled croak, rises dripping from his post and wings away his heavy flight; when the mountain hamlet is quiet, and the hand of death lies with leaden weight on the prostrate form of chief; where the strains of the mournful pibroch rise and float in the quivering air, till rock and glen and far off hill re-echo the weird lament.

The old pibrochs were all, without exception, written to commemorate some striking circumstance. A modern piper, may without great difficulty, construct a march or reel, but with the existant conditions of Highland life, in the gradual extinction of clan sentiment, and the Providential absence of civil strife, the source of inspiration is wanting, so that an historic pibroch of the old style is now an impossibility. It might also be added that, for the same reasons, the pipers of the present day do not grow up in sufficiently romantic conditions to enable them to rise to the high musical standard of the old pibroch composers. The playing of pibroch, as an art, cannot be said to be on the wane, as anyone may judge by listening to the excellent renderings of the famous old airs to be heard at many of our annual Highland Games, but the composition of pibroch may be considered as ended. Each pibroch, then, has its own history, a knowledge of which greatly increases the interest of the intelligent listener. The titles of some pibrochs explain themselves, such for instance as 'The Massacre of Glencoe,' and 'The Grant's Gathering.' The majority, however, are either connected with the memory of some prominent chieftain or bear titles requiring special explanation. Of the former class we may mention the well-known 'Mackintosh's Lament,' a pibroch composed about the year 1529, in memory of a highly esteemed chief named Lauchlan Mackintosh of Dunnachton, who met a violent death at the hands of his enemies. Other compositions of the same type are 'MacLeod of MacLeod's Lament,' in memory of Sir Roderick MacLeod of



Dunvegan, who died in 1626; and 'Sir Ewin Cameron of Lochiel's Salute,' a pibroch written in praise of a victory of the Cameron Clan when a famous single-handed combat took place between the chief, Sir Ewin, and an English officer.

As examples of pibrochs bearing more singular titles we may mention 'MacCrummen will never return,' composed by Donald Bain MacCrummen on account of a presentiment which took possession of his mind on leaving home in 1745. His duty was to accompany his master, the chief of MacLeod, in joining the royal forces against Prince Charlie. It happened that during an abortive attempt to capture the Pretender, who was resting at Moy Hall, the seat of The Mackintosh, on his retreat northwards, Donald Bain was shot. 'The Piper's warning to his Master' is another example. Campbell of Calder had been commissioned by the Earl of Argyll to expel a section of the MacDonald clan from Islay. Coll Ciotach, the chief, heard the coming of the Campbells and at once proceeded to the mainland for assistance in defending his island. Before he could return, however, Calder managed to take possession of his castle and imprison his retainers. The chief's piper, who had been left behind and was therefore a prisoner, noticed his master returning, and under pretence of playing a lament for the imprisoned condition of his clan, played a warning for his master not to return, as his castle was already in the hands of his enemy, who were lying in wait to seize him also. Coll Ciotach at once interpreted the warning and delayed his return, whereat Calder, perceiving the trick which had been played him, and being much enraged, called for the piper and had all his fingers cut off. 'Heart of my Heart! we've got the hill of you,' is an old pibroch which now, alas, seems to have become extinct. The title as given above indicates extreme sarcasm, but Sir Walter Scott, who, in his *Tales of a Grandfather*, relates the story of the victory, in commemoration of which the pibroch was written, says, referring to Coll of Keppoch, 'the victory of his tribe is still recorded in the pipe-tune, called "MacDonald took the brae on them."' The former title was given to the present writer by a descendant of the Keppoch family who spoke of the pibroch as having been last played by an old family fiddler. It was never completely written out, al-



though attempts to do so were made before the death of the old man. Be the title as it may, the events which gave rise to it may be briefly summarised as follows:—Mackintosh of Moy claimed the country of the Keppoch MacDonalds known as Glen Roy, and possessed Crown grants for the same. Arrangements to acquire the lands having totally failed on account of the opposition of the MacDonalds, Mackintosh, with the assistance of a company of soldiers under a Captain Mackenzie of Suddie, proceeded to take possession of the country. The settlement of the MacDonalds was found deserted, and Mackintosh, believing that his enemy had given in, commenced the building of a fortified castle for his own use. The MacDonalds, however, had secured the assistance of the neighbouring septs of Glengarry and Glencoe, and assembled in a narrow glen beyond a ridge of hills lying to the north-east of Keppoch. Mackintosh, hearing that an attack was imminent, decided to proceed at once upon the offensive, and marched his clansmen up the ridge of hills towards the encampment of the Keppoch chief during the night, intending to attack at break of day. The scouts of the MacDonalds, however, roused their camp to arms, and as the Mackintoshes approached the summit of the ridge the MacDonalds appeared upon the crest above them. A fierce battle immediately took place, in which the invading Mackintoshes were completely routed, and their chief taken prisoner. Either title of the pibroch therefore applies equally well. The MacDonalds were highly elated at their success, and proclaimed their chief 'Lord of Keppoch.' Whereat the captive Mackintosh is reported to have exclaimed, 'You are as far from being lord of the lands of Keppoch at this moment, as you have been all your life,' to which MacDonald, who from his remark can readily be imagined to have given the sarcastic title to the pibroch, said, 'Never mind, we'll enjoy the good weather while it lasts.' It does not seem to have lasted long, for Scott tells us that on account of the resistance to the royal troops under Captain Mackenzie,—who was killed in the engagement—sixty dragoons, and two hundred foot guards were detached to lay waste the Keppoch estates.

Only one more example of this old war-music need be given,

in a very old pibroch of the extreme north entitled 'The Carles with the Breeks, or Lord Breadalbane's March.' This pibroch commemorates a bloody victory which was gained by the Campbells of Glenurchy over the Sinclairs of Caithness. Glenurchy had managed to obtain a right to the Earldom of Caithness in spite of the apparently just claim of the previous Earl's grandson. The clan Sinclair, however, objected to the presence of the Campbells and, all legal methods failing, rose to arms for the purpose of expelling them. The Sinclair duniwassals, or gentlemen of the clan, were mounted and wore truis (tartan trousers, a curious dress to the Highland people of that time). In the battle which resulted, the Campbells not only completely defeated the Sinclairs but followed up their victory with what appears to have been a thorough massacre. The battle took place near Wick, and so many retreating Sinclairs met their death while attempting to cross the Wick river that the Campbells are said to have crossed the water dry shod by walking on the piled up bodies of their adversaries. Glenurchy's piper gets the credit of having burst forth in the extemporaneous music which now forms the pibroch, the notes of which at the time of its composition bore the contemptuous meaning 'The Carles with the breeks are flying from the field.'

In former days, the leading piper of a prominent chieftain was an official of great importance. He was commonly provided with one or two attendants whose duty was to care for his comfort, and keep his pipes and accoutrements in proper order. He was not infrequently a person of good family, and invariably received the respect and deference which his dignified position demanded. Sons of pipers were brought up to follow the occupation of their fathers, and in this way the position of piper became hereditary in all the leading families of the north. The MacCrummens, without doubt the most famous pipers and pibroch writers who ever lived, were hereditary pipers to The MacLeods of MacLeod; the MacArthurs to the Lords MacDonald of the Isles; the Mackays to The Mackenzies of Gairloch; and many other families of pipers to other chiefs in the same manner. The MacCrummens did so much in raising the standard of pibroch playing and of composition, that some

special mention is due to their memory in an article such as the present. The oldest traditions do not indicate when they first became connected with The MacLeods, but so distinguished did the family become, under a liberal patronage, that a college for the teaching of bagpipe music, *i.e.*, pibroch, was established under their supervision at a place called Boreraig, near Dunvegan in Skye. Pupils were sent to the MacCrummens from all parts of the country. They were lodged in a wing of the building and were diligently instructed in the fingering of the chanter. The difficulties of acquiring a thorough knowledge of pibroch and pibroch playing will be more readily understood when it is mentioned that pupils remained under instruction for five, six, and in some cases eight years. It became customary for chiefs to send their young pipers to Skye, and the teaching there bestowed upon them acquired such renown, that no piper was considered of the first rank who had not qualified at Boreraig. There seems also to have been a piper's college in the north of Ireland where the Scots of Ulster kept up the practice of their national instrument. It was established by a Highlander of some celebrity who had settled there. Its construction must have been considerably prior to the building of the Skye college, for one of the earliest MacCrummens, concerning whom anything is known, one Donald Mòr, was sent over to Ireland by MacLeod, for purposes of instruction. He was a mere youth, but already had acquired a wonderful knowledge of pipe music from his father, and is said to have had such a retentive ear and quick genius, that by listening to the lessons given to some other of the twenty-four pupils, who formed his companions, he was able, in a wonderfully short time, to play all the airs his master could teach him. Not long after his return to Scotland he got into serious difficulties in seeking to avenge the death of a foster brother. In his wrath, he, even a year after the murder of his kinsman, burned down in one night eighteen houses which stood on the property of Lord Kintail. Several stories are told about him which show his ungovernable temper as well as his great muscular strength and lofty pride. Nevertheless he seems to have been the fountain head of genius for the MacCrummen family, and composed many works, such for in-

stance as, 'MacLeod's Controversy,' about the year 1603; 'The MacDonald's Salute,' 'The Earl of Ross's March,' about 1600; and 'Donald Duaghal Mackay's Lament,' 1649.

His son Patrick Mòr succeeded him. He composed amongst other pibrochs 'The Lament for the Children' (seven of his own sons died in one year); 'I got a kiss of the King's Hand,' 1651; and 'John Garve MacLeod of Raasay's Lament,' about 1648. After him came Patrick Og, who seems to have been the best teacher and who had three sons; John, who became piper to the Earl of Seaforth, and wrote 'The Glen is Mine,' a well known pibroch; Donald Bain, who succeeded his father as piper to MacLeod, and who wrote, 'MacCrummen will never Return,' already referred to; and Farquhar, about whom little is known, but whose eldest son, Malcolm, succeeded Patrick Og at Dunvegan. Malcolm's eldest son, John Dhu, seems to have been the last of the MacCrummens who acted as pipers with the MacLeods of MacLeod. He died in his ninety-first year, in 1822.

Pibrochs are almost invariably written on one definite plan. The theme, 'urlar' or 'ground,' is given first of all. It is invariably slow in time, possessing curious intervals, and, according as the subject is sad or dignified, so the player has to express the sentiment, walking slowly the while. One, two, or three variations follow, each of which is 'doubled,' *i.e.*, played half as fast again, the notes of the melody being made of equal length. Each variation has its own system of warblers and grace notes, and a separate name, as the Suibhal, Taor-luath, and Crunluath. While playing the doubling of any variation the piper stands. After the crun-luath has been doubled, a performance which demands great precision and agility of fingering in the flashing of as many as fourteen grace notes in a bar, the original theme is slowly repeated and the pibroch ends. Formerly it was the practice to play the theme before the crunluath as well as at the end, but as a pibroch of average length occupies nearly ten minutes, this practice is now frequently discontinued. It may probably seem curious that laments and salutes should be composed on similar lines, but the arrangement of the melody, as well as the time and style of playing should, in good piping, make the sentiment at once apparent. The reader may also be

reminded that a very similar condition is to be found among old Lowland Scottish Songs. The old tune 'Hey, tuttie tattie,' which is believed to have been used as a battle-song by Robert the Bruce, is the same tune which now-a-days, when given with vigour and spirit, is called 'Scots, wha ha'e wi' Wallace bled,' or when slow and pathetic 'The Land o' the Leal.' No pibroch air can be used in forming two distinct tunes in this way, but the example shows to what an extent the mere method of rendering can alter an air.

While thus drawing attention more especially to the value of our old pibrochs, I do not wish to minimise the importance of the lighter and more modern class of pipe music. The history of our Highland regiments shows at once, how great has been the value of the bagpipe in the British Army. Yet here also it was first of all the pibroch, and not the military march which, in the early days of Highland regiments, called the men to arms and inspired them with courage for the heroic deeds they so often accomplished. For instance, before Quatre Bras the men of the Black Watch (42nd), who were billeted in Brussels, were called to quarters by the playing of an old pibroch entitled 'Come to me and I will give you flesh.' It is a pibroch of one of the MacCrummens and was composed in the midst of the battle of Inverlochy in 1427 when Donald Balloch of the Isles was victorious over the Royal forces. The complete pibroch is given in Keltie's edition of MacLachlan's *History of the Scottish Highlands*, division 7, p. 446.

The rousing quality of the pipe march has been often put to the test, and the battles of Alma, Lucknow, or the more recent Tel-el-Kebir, gave many opportunities for showing what Highlanders can do when thoroughly inspired by the strains of their native instrument. Moreover, the pipe bands have no doubt done much to keep up the interest of the old country, and bridge over a period when, owing to the rapid march of Saxon influences, old Celtic sentiment had fallen somewhat into abeyance. At the present day, it would appear that a revival is slowly setting in, and although bagpipe playing and kilt wearing may in many instances be instigated by most modern and unromantic impulses, we cannot but rejoice that the large collection of airs for our



historic instrument is being opened up from the hidden stores of the past. One evil of modern times, we have to deplore, and it is an evil almost entirely chargeable to regimental piping. A custom has become established, in almost all our regiments where brass or string bands exist, for the bandmaster to arrange all manner of tunes to suit his own band whilst bringing some coveted distinction to his own name. Thus we have 'Selections' from Italian operas, from national airs, or from music hall songs, which vary according to the musical capabilities and discretion of the bandmaster. The pipe-major has naturally followed suit, and has not sufficiently calculated the capabilities of his essentially Celtic instrument. He has twisted and contorted fine old tunes into regimental pipe marches, with the result that, far too often, he has spoilt a fine tune without making a good march. In this way, such tunes as 'Turn ye to Me,' 'Miss Forbes' Farewell to Banff,' 'I'm wearin' awa' Jean,' and many others, have been treated. Such tunes cannot be rendered on the bagpipes, because their true airs cannot be adapted to the chanter scale. To attempt such a course is a breach of good taste and a violation of all musical propriety. Even amongst airs specially-written for the pipes, a distinction can be drawn between that which is exactly suited to the peculiarities of the instrument, and that which at times is apt to draw attention to the limits beyond which the instrument is unable to go. It was this exact adaptation, and perfect good taste which so distinguished the pibroch music of the MacCrummens. Their music is the pure music of the Highland pipe, as it is the music of no other instrument. Brought up with none but the chanter scale ever present to their ears, they seem to have been saturated with the true essence of Celtic music. The violation of this principle of adaptation has most certainly been the cause of much of the prejudice expressed against the bagpipes. This is all the more to be deplored since it is through our Highland regiments that a knowledge of the music of the pipes is mostly known. In India or Egypt, in Canada, or the West Indies, wherever our Highlanders are stationed, there the sound of the bagpipe makes its impression. Let us then strive to maintain the purity of our Celtic music, to



uphold its true quality while we discourage the introduction of all unsuitable and impossible combinations. Our bagpipe music, both at home and abroad, will then call forth the memories of our Highland mountains, and worthily represent the nation at whose hands it has been the means of producing so much. In times of rejoicing when the heartsome reel strikes up its merry note we shall ever fling care and old age to the winds, exulting that we have an instrument which can force us to dance as it can move us to tears; an instrument which has sounded its war-blast in every field of British glory; that has been, and that can be, borne far into the thickest of every fight.

W. L. CALDERWOOD.

---

ART. IX.—THE SEIZURE OF A TURKISH FLAGSHIP.

[Translated from the Greek of the k. Demetrios Bikelas by the Rev. W. Metcalfe, B.D., with the permission of the Author.]

IN the year 1760, about the first days of spring, the Capitan Pasha honoured the island of Kôs with his presence. Every year the Turkish fleet used to sail in full array from the Bosphorus, thread the Hellespont, and visit the islands of the Ægean one by one to exact the poll-tax. Every year the unfortunate islanders awaited the appearance of the fleet in fear and trembling. True, the elders had taken measures in good time to collect the amount required, and were ready to pay the tribute. But this was not enough. The Pasha wished a gift on his own account; while his officers, sailors, and marines, following his excellent example, and encouraged by his non-interference, went ashore to try their fortune as well. Then woe to the Christians! Fortunate the man who was merely robbed, and got off without a blow of a yataghan or a pistol-bullet.\*

Tournefort, who paid a visit to the Ægean in 1700, was at Antiparos when the Captain Pasha's fleet was sighted. We may

---

\* See Eton, *Survey of the Turkish Empire*, p. 177.

remark in passing that the population of the island then was about seventy families, and the tax exacted amounted to 1200 scudi or grosia, for at that time the grosi had the value of a scudi. Such was the terror of the islanders, says Tournefort, that not so much as a towel or a handkerchief was to be seen in their houses. As soon as they saw the fleet in the distance, they fled to the hills, and hid any valuables they had in caves, or buried them in the earth. But what was the use of this? Suspecting that the inhabitants had hidden their goods, the Turks seized the chief men, and beat them until their wives brought their own treasures and their neighbours'. Often too, not content with these, they would lead away even women and children in chains. It must be confessed, adds Tournefort, that the Turkish divining-rod possesses great virtue. \*

To resume, the inhabitants of Kôs having been taxed and plundered and beaten, the Turks prepared to set sail and delight the other islands with their visits. But it was Bairam and Friday, so they were in no haste. The Pasha and the crews lingered on the island, praying or amusing themselves, or perhaps torturing some Christian just unearthed from his lair; while the islanders waited impatiently the much desired hour of their departure. They would return next year: but till then, at least, they would not see them. Perhaps, in the meantime, pirates might visit them instead of the Turks, from Algiers or from Christian Malta, one set worse than the other. Yet perhaps they might not. In any case, Patience! Could these wretches have imagined any other kind of life? An endurable existence, a strong law, personal liberty, secure possession of the fruits of their labours—both names and ideas were alike unknown to them. The common incidents of their daily lives were raids by pashas or pirates, captivity, the lash, spoliation, sometimes the chain and benches of the galleys. When one thinks on these horrors, the wonder is that they managed to exist, and that the *Ægean* islands were not utterly depopulated. Perhaps it was because neither Turks nor pirates desired it as advantageous. As a matter of fact Tournefort

---

\* Vol. I., p. 186.

found only three hundred inhabitants on Patmos, three hundred families on Skyros, two hundred souls only on Sikinos, one hundred and twenty families on Pholegandros. Seventy years later Choiseul-Gouffier found only two hundred inhabitants in Mèlos, and a like number on Kimòlos. Yet somehow men managed to exist on those happy islands, which once sent forth numerous colonies from their surplus population to every shore of the Mediterranean.

Prominent among the vessels which had cast anchor off Kòs was the flagship, a handsome eighty gun ship. The Pasha, stretched perhaps on a soft carpet after his usual prayer, beheld her from the beach with gratified pride, as she lay out in the open beyond the other vessels—for so large a ship could not enter the harbour—with her full bows, and shore-ward turned stern, the windows of which blazed in the light of the setting sun.

There were few Turks aboard her. The greater number were ashore with the Pasha; but the few who remained were sufficient to guard the Christian portion of the crew, which consisted of seventy slave sailors.

It is hard for us to picture the life of those unhappy beings, whether chained to the oars of the galleys, or, in more recent times, forced to serve on the sailing vessels of the Turkish fleet. Our popular poetry has preserved the echo of their moans, which resounded beneath the crimson of the crescent standard. Who does not know the most touching poem:—

‘Out from the East we sailing came on board a golden galley,  
And five Pashas we had on board, the same could sing right fairly;  
And slaves we had, full comely slaves, bound fast in heavy irons.

The slave did groan, full loud he groaned, as if his heart were breaking,  
Another groan went up to Heaven, still stood the noble galley.

Then heard the Bey, and loud from off the quarter-deck he shouted:

“If that one of my sailors be, then be ye all accursed.

But if it be a slave who groaned; straightway I grant his freedom.

Dost hunger slave? Dost thirst my slave? My slave dost thou need  
raiment?”

“’Tis not for meat, ’tis not for drink, nor yet is it for raiment,

I on my mother thought and groaned, my winsome wife remembered.

Two days I was her bridegroom dear, twelve years I’ve rowed a galley.”

“My slave, I prithee tell thy tale, and I will grant thee freedom.”

"Oft have I sung my woes ere now, and never lived unfettered,  
But now if freedom be the prize of telling o'er my sorrows,  
Bring me the lute on which I play, my lute with strings of silver,  
That I may sing and tell abroad the sorrows of my bondage.  
Twelve years a prisoner have I toiled, upon the sands of Berber,  
And walnuts nine I planted, before my prison's portal,  
And of the nine have tasted fruit, yet never gained my freedom.

If thou a mother hast, or child, Pasha, O, grant me freedom."

The seventy slaves on board the flagship were Greeks, Italians, French, and Maltese, some captured on the Greek coasts, others made prisoners in various engagements with Christian vessels.

Among the latter was one Simon, an Italian from the shores of the Papal States, who had been captured some years previously on board a vessel flying the flag of the Prince of Monaco, a flag to which now belongs the unenviable reputation of protecting the last national gaming saloon in Europe.

This Simon had conceived the daring plan of not merely gaining liberty for himself and his companions, but also of seizing the frightful vessel on which they dragged about their fetters. How long he had brooded over this scheme, how he had succeeded in inspiring courage in his fellow captives, or what preparations he had made for carrying out his plans, all this, in default of particulars, must be left to the reader's imagination.

The Turks on board the ship were resting unapprehensive on this Friday of Bairam, when suddenly, the seventy conspirators rushed upon them, forced them to take refuge in the poop, shut them below deck, and cutting chains and cables adrift, spread sail to a favourable wind.

From the beach the Pasha gazed thunderstruck, unable to make out what was going on. Shouts were heard on the island, commands, threats, curses. Boats were got ready. The Turks dispersed over the island were summoned by drum, by shots, the vessels in the harbour weighed anchor, sails were unfurled, agitation and tumult and confusion reigned everywhere.

All this time the Turks shut up in the flagship had not re-

mained with folded hands. If they could disable the rudder, the mutineers' scheme might fail. The vessel would become unmanageable, and be hindered. The Pasha would recapture her and free them from capture, from bondage, from death. So to disable the rudder.

They managed to succeed.

But Simon was not easily daunted. Having become masters of the arm-chest, the Christians were now well armed; and desperation, and the prospect of freedom had increased their forces ten-fold. While the flagship was being sailed rudderless, Simon went below at the head of a party of his crew. Their axes broke down the doors and partitions behind which the Turks had taken refuge. The struggle in the darkness was fearful. On either side the battle was for liberty or death. Five of Simon's men were killed. Of the Turks, some were slain, others, chased out into the ship, succeeded in jumping overboard through the port-holes, while the majority were taken and put into the hold in irons. The prudent Simon spared their lives, not from pity, but to hold them as hostages against the hour of defeat, or to show as living evidence of his triumph in the event of his reaching a Christian port in safety.

All this happened in the twinkling of an eye. The rudder was repaired, and the flagship proceeded on her course, though without the crescent at her masthead.

Meanwhile a Ragusan ship had entered the harbour of Kôs in full sail. The Pasha, biting his fingers, and beside himself with rage at the slowness of his men in the harbour, saw the approach of the stranger ship with joy. Attended by a crowd of armed men, he surrounded the Ragusan with his boats before she cast anchor, boarded her, and turned her prow in the direction of the retreating flagship, whose progress had been checked by the scuffle between decks, and the repairs to her rudder.

The Ragusan vessel bounded over the waves. She carried few guns; but hundreds of Turks were on board, breathing out threatenings, and if once she were brought alongside the flagship, how could five and sixty of a crew resist their



onset? But when the vessels were near each other, Simon called out in a voice of thunder, 'Keep off, or I burn the flagship and you.'

The Pasha bethought himself. He knew that Simon's words were not idle threats. He ordered the vessel's course to be altered. Could he have foreseen his fate, he would probably have preferred to die amid flames and explosions. Perhaps he recalled just then what one of the Sultans had said, 'God has given the dry land to the Faithful, but the sea he has left to the unbelievers.' However, he returned in shame to the port of Kôs, while Simon sailed on to Malta.

When the Maltese saw a man-of-war of such size, Turkish-rigged, making for the harbour, they were astounded. The cannon on the ramparts were levelled at her, their galleys put out from the harbour in readiness to attack, and the whole military force of the island was set in motion. But when it was known that instead of a Turkish crew, the vessel carried Turkish prisoners, unrestrained delight took the place of their former alarm. Simon and his companions were conducted in triumph to church, and tears of joy rolled down those sun-burned cheeks.

The news of this unexpected occurrence aroused very different feelings at Constantinople. Sultan Mustapha ordered the Capitan Pasha to be beheaded at once, that the punishment of his carelessness might serve as a warning to others. At the same time the Porte made bitter representations about the asylum given to the stolen vessel. The Vizier Rageb sent special representations to the French Ambassador of the day, seeking the restoration of the ship through the intervention of France. Failing this, he threatened to re-take her by force of arms. The government of the then all-powerful Louis XV. compelled the Knights of S. John to accede to the Porte's demands. So, early in the year 1761, the captured ship entered the Bosphorus flying the French colours, and convoyed by a French frigate, the *Oiseau*. The vessel fired a salute of twenty-one guns, and when that had been answered, the French colours were hauled down, the Ottoman hoisted, and she cast anchor below the walls of the Seraglio. Her loss a year previously had so dis-



turbed the people of Constantinople, that her return was hailed as a victory, and publicly celebrated.

These facts are related by the French writer Chénier,\* who, it is well known, married a Greek lady of Constantinople, and became the father of two well known poets, André in particular, an ornament to French literature. But Athanasios Komnénos Ypsilantès, chief surgeon to the above-mentioned Vizier Rageb Mohamet—‘his most noble master,’ as he calls him—says nothing about this affair in his history under the years 1760 and 1761. However, another French traveller Sonnini† who made a tour in the East by order of the unfortunate Louis XVIII, in 1777, or fifteen years after Simon’s successful venture, not only corroborates M. de Chénier, but was personally acquainted with Simon. But he does not call him so. He suppresses the name that he bore, and refers to him as Captain G—. He met him at Kimôlos, which was then, and had been for a century, the haunt of the Christian pirates, or corsairs, as they were more politely termed. There, they usually spent the winter in riot and revelry. Dissipating the profits of their booty, they spent much money in the island: but as Choiseul Gouffier remarks, the natives probably earned it at the cost of much oppression. The money came in to pay the Ottoman tribute when the fleet under the Capitan Pasha came after the pirates had taken their departure for a season.

We should observe that no stigma was then attached to the calling of pirate. On the contrary, those engaged in it, according to Tournefort, were men of high reputation, and noted valour. He adduces the names of several Frenchmen of noble birth who were distinguished pirates. The reminiscences and traditions of that time current in the Aegean, serve to explain the spread of piracy in those seas during the Revolution. The islanders, following the example of those noble Frenchmen, sinned by anachronism, assuming fashions out of date by a century.

Such was the calling followed by our friend Simon, or Captain G—, when Sonnini met him at Kimôlos in command of

---

\* *Révolutions de l’Empire Ottoman*, par M. de Chénier. Paris, 1789.

† *Tà metà tήν Ἀλυσίαν*. Constantinople, 1870.

a light but well armed ship. He describes him as a man full of daring, coolness, and remarkable firmness.

'The Greeks,' he said, 'tremble before him as before the commanders of the Turkish vessels, for the oppression of either party is equally bad. That of the Maltese is not so fierce and inhuman as the Turks, but is more to be feared as calm, cool, and measured. At Kimôlos, I saw the ruins of a house demolished by him, which none dared rebuild. This was his reason—pitiable indeed is the lot of the Greeks who inhabit the little islands of the Aegean. No one pays any attention to them, except for purposes of robbery and oppression. If a Turkish vessel, even a small galley, puts in anywhere, its captain at once becomes unquestioned despot of the island. The rulers make haste to kiss his hand, and place themselves at his command. He controls everything, demands provisions and whatever he wants, is self-appointed judge, from whom there is no appeal, decides cases, imposes fines, and insists on their payment forthwith, distributes the bastinado on the feet right and left; in a word, his presence causes fear and trembling. At last the Turk sails away, then comes a pirate vessel from Malta. Almost the same scenes of violence and arbitrary power are repeated, the same slavish obeisances, the same bribes, the same exactions, the same exercise of the right of the stronger, the same degradation of the weak, the same and worse oppression.

'Among the services exacted from the inhabitants, when either Turks or Maltese cast anchor at any port, is that of watching from the higher points of the island, so as to sight any ships at sea when still far out, and give the strangers timely warning of approaching danger. When Captain G. arrived he gave the usual order for a watch to be set at various towers built on the heights of Kimôlos for this very purpose. But on his departure, he saw a strange vessel approaching unexpectedly. The carelessness of the sentinel was cruelly punished by the utter demolition of his home. After many years had passed, I saw what was once the dwelling of a numerous family become a harbour for thorns and creeping things.

‘Soon after, I myself was an eye witness of a similar scene. G. and ten of his crew landed at Kimólos, and while his sailors scattered over the island, and plundered the inhabitants, he breakfasted at the French Consul’s house, where I was a guest at the time. Suddenly his men came to him out of breath, with the news that a vessel, hostile, to all appearance, is sailing towards Kimólos. G. was in no way disconcerted, but ordered them to bring the chief man of the island. He came to him, and G. asked him who was stationed on such and such a tower. The chief told the man’s name. G. with the manner of one used to impose immediate and unquestioning obedience, gave orders for him to be seized without delay and brought into his presence. And then only, he rose from the table and said to the sailors, “Forward, my men, let us prepare to fight and beat those infidel dogs, the Turks.” Meanwhile it had been ascertained that the ship was not Turkish, but Ragusan. Notwithstanding, he remained, intending to take dire vengeance on the Kimólian. After many entreaties the Consul and I succeeded in appeasing him, and in saving the luckless islander from his fate.

‘Some days afterwards, G. captured a carvel on a voyage from Alexandria, containing a rich cargo, the yearly tribute sent from Egypt to the Sultan. By such a haul he was delivered once for all from the life of a pirate. But I doubt if the G. who full of years and scars, was possessed of a competency at Malta, was the man to lead a peaceful life, or to redeem a youth spent in robbery and violence by an old age of good works.’

So far Sonnini, I wonder if any tradition respecting Simon is still preserved in Kimólos?

DEMETRIOS BIKELAS.

---

ART. X.—THE POLITICAL THEORIES OF ST.  
THOMAS AQUINAS.

THE time has passed when the writings of the schoolmen were only mentioned with a sneer, and even in England the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, a theologian placed by Leo XIII. on a level with the great fathers of the Church, are now seriously studied. But it is not merely as a theologian that he deserves to be read : in philosophy he harmonised the Aristotelian doctrines with Christianity, while in politics he is the greatest writer of the Middle Ages on the Papal side, in that struggle which lasted for two centuries between the papacy and the empire, a struggle which still in its fundamental points survives, in the conflicting claims of Church and State as to the jurisdiction each is to exercise over men's lives and the relations which should exist between the spiritual and the temporal powers.

It needs no apology then if I attempt here to collect together and arrange in some order the views expressed by St. Thomas on the theory of politics. The task is one requiring some labour, as important passages are to be found scattered throughout many works, though there are also several connected passages of some length dealing with portions of the subject.

I am not aware of any work in English which deals at length with the writings of St. Thomas on this matter, but monographs have been written on it both in German and in French. In German we have the work of Dr. Baumaun,\* and the later and more satisfactory treatise by Dr. Antonius Basiliades entitled 'Staats lehre des Thomes ab Aquino.† In French there is a very interesting monograph by Tengeny, published in 1857, under the title 'Essaie sur les doctrines politiques de St. T. d'Aquin.' Briefer references to the same subject are also to be found in Jourdain‡ and in Janet.§ The last men-

---

\* Die Staats-lehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquino.

† Published in 1890.

‡ Charles Brectellet Jourdain, *La Philosophie de St. T. d'Aquin*, 1858.

§ Paul Janet, *Historie de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale*, 1887.

tioned writer's sketch is spoiled by the use of the treatise attributed to St. Thomas called the 'De Regimine Principum,' a work which he treats as though it were by disciples of St. Thomas who probably correctly represent his views. The truth appears to be that a part of the work is due to St. Thomas himself, while the remainder is almost worthless so far as regards any attempt to ascertain from it his opinions. Werner in his work on St. Thomas \* gives an account of his philosophy, which covers some of the points treated in this article. In Italian there is a treatise by Barri,† which is, however, almost useless as an exposition of the doctrines of St. Thomas, as the writer uses the whole of the 'De Regimine' as though genuine. In English I am only aware of a sketch of the subject by Mr. R. Lane-Poole,‡ in his excellent 'Illustrations of Mediæval Thought,' and a sketch dealing with St. Thomas' treatment of Kingship by Mr. Kingsford in his edition of the 'Song of Lewes.' These are all the works on this subject I have been able to see, but there are others, such as a book edited by W. von Kelleter, entitled *De Regimine Principum die Philosophie des Aquinas*, to which I have not been able to refer.

Those desirous of making themselves acquainted at first hand with the political theories of St. Thomas need not be deterred by the bulk of his writings. While there are important references elsewhere, a fairly complete view of his theories can be obtained by reading the first book and the first four chapters of the second book of the *De Regimine Principum*,§ the short treatise *De Regimine Judaeorum*, and the sections in the *Summa Theologica* on law and justice—1, 2 Ques. 91-108,

---

\* 'Der heilige Thomas von Aquinas,' 1888-89.

† Antonio Barri, *Le Teorie Politiche dissan Tommaso e il moderno diritto pubblico*, 1889.

‡ Reginald Lane-Poole, *Illustrations of Mediæval Thought*.

§ This portion of the treatise has been proved to be from the hands of St. Thomas by De Rubeis, a learned writer of last century, whose dissertations on the genuineness of various works attributed to St. Thomas are contained in the Venetian edition of the works of Aquinas published last century. These dissertations are also prefixed to the Roman edition now coming out.

The remainder of the *De Regimine* is from other hands.



and 2, 2 Ques. 57-62 respectively. The Commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* may also be studied with profit, but it must be remembered that the Commentary on the last four or five books appears to have been written not by St. Thomas, but by Peter of Auvergne, a disciple of his, who, however, probably in general very accurately expresses the views of St. Thomas. It is also necessary to bear in mind in reading the Commentary that St. Thomas does not necessarily look at things from the same point of view as Aristotle even where he does not expressly dissent from him. Probably St. Thomas, who generally speaks of Aristotle as 'the philosopher, was frequently not fully conscious how far apart their opinions were. To take an example, in commenting on Aristotle's discussion of slavery in the first book of the *Politics*, St. Thomas does not expressly deny that slavery is natural, in Aristotle's sense, but his view appears really to be that slavery is a punishment for sin, and unnatural in the strict sense of the term. While thus the Commentary on the *Politics* must be used with caution, it is very valuable not only as an excellent exposition of the text, but also as showing how St. Thomas understood Aristotle.

Though St. Thomas rarely makes historical allusions, and the few to be found in his writings are generally either to events mentioned by Aristotle or to incidents connected with the history of Rome, especially in the times of the Republic, yet it is necessary to bear in mind what the times were in which he wrote. The son of Count Landolph of Aquino and of Theodora, Countess of Theano, he belonged, on his father's side, to a family which claimed descent from the Frangipanis, who included among their members Gregory the Great. The Aquino family are said by Werner \* to be first mentioned in history in 879 as princes of Capua and Salerno. Count Landolph's brother was abbot of the great monastery of Monte Casino. On his mother's side St. Thomas was related to the Caracciolis, a Norman family which was said to have founded for itself a kingdom in Sicily, and to which royal rank was

---

\* I owe to him several of my statements regarding the family of St. Thomas Aquinas.



granted by Nicholas II. Through them he was connected with Peter of Arragon, also with Louis IX. of France. He had two brothers who held high command under Frederic II., to whose cause his family were long attached. On their forsaking him, one brother was banished, while the other died in prison. The property of the family was devastated and Aquino was rased to the ground. St. Thomas was born in 1226, only ten years after the death of Innocent III., in whose time the papal power perhaps reached its highest point. In 1243, notwithstanding the violent opposition of his family, which at that time still belonged to the Imperialist party, he joined the Dominican order, whose whole influence was on the side of the Pope in the struggle then going on between the papacy and the empire. After a few years spent as a disciple and assistant of Albertus Magnus at Cologne and Paris, St. Thomas began to lecture at the latter place, where he soon became famous. His later years were mostly passed in Italy, where he was constantly consulted by the Popes on all theological questions, and at whose special request some of his works were written. Notwithstanding his strenuous opposition he was made Archbishop of Naples in 1272. He died in 1277.

St. Thomas, though his whole philosophical system, including his theory of politics, is profoundly affected by the influence of Aristotle, yet offers a strong contrast to him in his method. He rarely appeals to experience, but prefers to derive everything from first principles. This does not exclude a very sensible treatment of practical questions as they arise, for he never loses sight of the necessity of adapting our measures to men as we find them, with all their faults and imperfections. Though a strong papalist there is no trace in his writings of the mere partisan, and nothing is perhaps more remarkable than the entire absence of all trace of personal feeling in a man whose early life was passed in times of such violent conflict, and in which his family suffered much.\*

Though St. Thomas is an Aristotelian, he is first of all a Christian, and this necessarily leads with him to a different

---

\* *Sum.*, 1, q., 1, 4, 0.

conception of the importance of politics. While with Aristotle it is the supreme science to which all others are subordinate, with St. Thomas this place belongs to theology. The distinction is not merely theoretical, but has a direct bearing on the relations of the Church to the State, for St. Thomas never allows us to forget that all political institutions must in a well-governed state, at all events indirectly, help to prepare man for his final end, the fruition of God. Aristotle deals only with this world, of which to St. Thomas the importance lies in the fact that it is a place of probation and of preparation for the world to come.

Among human sciences, on the other hand, St. Thomas gives politics the first place,\* so far as regards those which deal not merely with knowledge, but also with practice. Its place among practical and merely human sciences is due to the fact that it has to do with the State,† which, to St. Thomas's mind, is more important than any other thing which can be known and brought to pass by the human reason. The importance attached by St. Thomas to the State is due to his holding as strongly as even Aristotle that man is unable, except in society, to reach his full development. Man,‡ he says, is naturally a social and political animal, living as one of a multitude, even more than any other animal. This is proved by the natural wants of man, for while other creatures are provided by nature with food, covering, and means of defence, man, naturally destitute of all these, is, instead, gifted with reason whereby he is enabled to provide himself with all things he requires, by the work of his hands. For their preparation, however, one man would not suffice; and, moreover, while other animals act by instinct and know what is useful or hurtful to them, men can only acquire this knowledge by the combi-

---

\* *Commentary on Politics*, p. 11, D. My references are to the Venice edition of 1568.

† *Commentary on Politics*, 1, 2, B.

‡ *De Regimine*, I. 1. I have in the text reproduced in a condensed shape and in a different order the arguments of St. Thomas in the first chapter of the *De Regimine* to prove that man is naturally a social animal and requires rulers. *Conf. Sum.*, 1, q. 96, 4, 0, and 3, 0.

nation of many who use their reason, each to investigate different matters and so help one another. That it is necessary for man to live as one of a multitude appears also very clearly from the fact, that to him is peculiar the power of speech by which one man can express his whole thoughts (conceptions) to another, while other animals can only communicate to one another their passions.

Were men able to live alone, then might each, under God, be a king to himself, guiding his own actions, by the light of reason divinely given to him, to the end set before him; but it is natural to him to live in the society of many, and were each to confine himself to providing for his own wants, the multitude would be broken up (in diverso dispergeretur) unless there were also some one having charge of what pertains to the good of the whole multitude. The necessity for government would have existed even in man's first state, the state of innocence; firstly, because man being naturally a social animal he would in that state also have lived in society; and this of itself necessitates a ruler. Secondly, because even in that state, man, though free from defects, would have been unequal, not only as regards sex, but also as regards age, strength, and beauty; nay more, they would have been unequal not only in body, but also in soul (*anima*), in things pertaining to justice and knowledge; and it would have been unjust had men, excelling their fellows in knowledge and justice, not been allowed to exercise their powers for the benefit of others.

St. Thomas thus knows nothing of a state of nature in the sense in which that phrase is generally used by later writers to describe a condition of things where there is no human government or law save that of reason. With him \* the state of innocence is that state in which, before the fall, man's soul was yet uncorrupted while his body was wholly subject to the soul and in no wise hindered it, and yet, even at that time, though man existed free from all defects of body or soul,† and though his reason was then subject to God, and his inferior powers to his reason, the government of man over man would

---

\* *Sum.*, 1, q., 94, 2, C.

† *Sum.*, 1, q., 94, 4, O.

have existed.\* St. Thomas then derives human government from a necessity which exists apart from man's defects, the cause to which it is attributed by Hooker, Hobbes, Locke, and even Rousseau. He appears, on this point, so far as I am acquainted † with their writings, not to be in accord with many mediæval writers, who appear generally to put the state of man before the fall in the place which the state of nature occupies in later writers.

As far as I am aware, and I do not think I have overlooked any passage on the subject, St. Thomas does not even mention man's corruption as an additional reason for government, though he would have had the strongest authority for doing so. He quotes in fact both Augustine and Gregory the Great on the subject. With regard to the latter, he says, ‡ 'dicit enim Gregorius quod ubi non deliquimus omnes pares sumus: sed in statu innocentie non erat delictum; ergo omnes erant pares;' but he maintains § that Gregory only refers to inequalities amounting to defects, so that some may rightly be penally coerced by others. Such inequalities could not have existed in the state of innocence. From Augustine, he quotes, || 'Hominem rationalem ad imaginem suam factum non voluit Deus nisi irrationabilibus dominari, non hominem homini, sed hominem de cori;' but explains it away ¶ by referring Augustine's statement to dominion of the nature of slavery. Such government of man over man there could not have been in the state of innocence, but this would not have prevented government such as is compatible with the freedom of those subject to it.

It may here be noted that St. Thomas, like other mediæval writers, uses such phrases as 'omnes homines natura sunt pares;' \*\* or 'homines non sunt sibi invicem praeeminentes secundum ordinem naturae;' †† or 'quantum ad naturalia omnes

\* *Sum.*, 1. q., 96, 4, 0.

† *Sum.*, 1. q., 96, 3, p. 1.

|| *Sum.*, 1. q. 96, 4, p. 1.

\*\* *Sum.*, 2, 2, q. 104, 5, 0. 2.

† At second hand.

§ *Sum.*, 1. q. 96, 3, p. 1.

¶ *Sum.*, 1. q. 96, 4, 0.

†† *Scriptum in Secundum Librum Sententiarum illustrio Petri Lombardi*, Vol. II., Dis. vi., q. 1, 4, 5. I shall quote references to this work hereafter, as *Sen.* 2, 3, according to volume referred to.

sunt pares;’\* but it will appear from what has already been said that it would be very unsafe to argue from them that St. Thomas holds the natural equality of men in the sense in which modern writers speak of them as equal. I do not profess, indeed, to be able fully to explain what St. Thomas meant when he said, ‘homines non sunt sibi invicem praeeminentes secundum ordinem naturae.’ The passage occurs in his earliest work, a commentary on the sentences of Peter Lombard, and it is possible that he had not at that time so strong a conviction of the necessity of human government in this world whether before or after the fall as later. It is perhaps more probable that St. Thomas merely means that men are not like angels and devils, divided into orders rising one above another, but the passage does not explain itself, and it is of the less consequence, as his views expressed elsewhere appear to be quite clear.

Before the fall, he holds,† men though free from defects, were unequal in natural perfections. On the other hand they were all equal ‘quantum ad naturalia,’ that is to say, in things pertaining to the nature of the body. Thus men were subject only to God in matters relating to the maintenance of life or the propagation of the race. Moreover, before the fall men were equal in liberty, for they were all ‘sui causa,’ that is to say, their final end was not the well-being of others, and therefore the aim of governors must have been to benefit their subjects, as is now the case in all rightful governments, so far as regards those who are free. The fall has left men unchanged ‘questum ad naturalia,’ therefore slaves are not bound to obey their masters, nor children their parents, as regards entering into the married state or retaining their virginity or other matters of this kind. On the other hand men are now no longer all ‘sui causa,’ for slavery has been introduced as a punishment for sin, inasmuch as man by sinning departs from obedience to reason and falls in a manner into the same state of slavery as the beasts, so that like them he may be disposed

\* *Sum.*, 4, D. 36, q. 1, 2, 1.

† Cf. the *Sum.*, 1, q., 96, 3 and 4; 2, 2 q., 57, 3, 2; q., 64, 2, 3; q., 104, 50; and the *Sentences* 2 D., 44, q. 1, 3, 1 and 4 D., 36 q. 1, 2, 0 and 1.



of in a way serviceable to others. Nay more,\* such are now the differences between men that the relation of slavery may benefit both master and servant where the master is wise, while the servant can help him by his bodily strength.

The question of slavery is closely connected with that of the inequality of men, but as a sufficiently full treatment of the subject would take up some space and interfere with the more general development of the political theories of St. Thomas I hope to deal with the point elsewhere, and it will here suffice again to note that he looks upon slavery as unnatural in the full sense of the term, and as, generally speaking, justifiable only as a punishment for sin.

It has been shown that human government is necessary to society, and that in this alone man can live his full life. We have now to see whence individual men derive the right to govern their fellow creatures? Is this power directly delegated by God, or how does it arise? All things, St. Thomas says, † are subject to the rule of the deity, and nothing can be exempt from his government, for the end of divine government is the goodness of God (*ipsa sua bonitas*), and there cannot be anything which is not ordained to that end.‡ It pertains to his perfect goodness that all things be subject to order, and this requires § variety and inequality among things created. While || God governs all things directly so far as the principles of government are concerned (*quantum ad rationem gubernationis pertinet*), he sometimes uses others as his instruments to carry out his orders. The reason of this is that the better the government the greater is the perfection of which it is the cause in those things which are subject to it. Now as a thing which is not only good in itself but also the cause of goodness in others is more perfect than that which is merely good in itself, God so

---

\* *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 57, 3, 2. St. Thomas does not bring this into connection with the fall, but it can only be of man after the fall he is speaking. He refers here to Aristotle, *Politics*, Book I., ch. 5.

† *Sum.*, 1, q., 103, 4, 0.

‡ *Contra Gentiles*, Book III., ch. 140, 4.

§ *Cont. Gent.*, B. 2, ch. 45, 7.

|| *Sum.*, 1, q., 193, 6, 0. I have in this passage very closely followed the words of St. Thomas.



rules the universe, that in governing he makes some things to be the causes of other things, just as if a master were not only to give his disciples knowledge but also to make them teachers of others. Man being ordained \* for eternal beatitude, an end which exceeds his natural faculties, divine law is needed for the guidance of human life. In some matters † indeed God uses human governors as his instruments, and were not man ordained to an end outside himself (*bonum exterius*) such rulers would suffice; but as his end is the divine fruition, to attain it he requires a ruler no mere man but also God. This ruler is Christ, from whom the royal priesthood is derived. 'The necessity of this kingdom, that spiritual things may be distinguished from things terrestrial, is entrusted not to earthly kings but to priests, and especially to the high priest, the successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff to whom all kings of the Christian people should be subject as to our Lord Jesus Christ himself.'

We see then that so far as the spiritual power is exercised by man over man it is directly delegated by God. This is not usually the case in political society with the temporal power. In his commentary on the epistle to the Romans ‡ St. Thomas remarks that the power of the king or that of any other person in authority may be considered from three points of view, (1) We may look at the power itself, and in this respect it is from God, for it is by him that kings reign. (2). We may consider the mode of acquiring power. In this respect it is sometimes from God, as when a man obtains it in a lawful way (*ordinate*). Sometimes it is not from God but from men's perverse appetite, when acquired by ambition or by some other illicit means. (3). We may ask ourselves how it is used. Here also power is sometimes from God, as in the case of a man who uses the power allowed to him in accordance with the precepts of divine justice. It is not from God when men use the power given to them in contravention of these precepts. In the *Summa* § again

\* *Sum.*, 1, 2, q., 91, 4, 9.

† *De Reg.*, I., 14.

‡ Ch. xiii. v. 1.

§ *Sum.*, 2, 2 q., 10, 10, 0. He is evidently here not considering such cases as those mentioned in the Old Testament where rulers were appointed directly by God.

St. Thomas expressly declares that dominion and superiority (dominium et praelatio) have been introduced by human law.

From whence then does man's authority come? Aristotle's view appears to be that all lawful rule arises from natural superiority, and that not merely in the case of the true monarchy or aristocracy, but even in the *πολιτεία*. The reason of this is that, according to Aristotle,\* some men are naturally rulers, while others are naturally ruled. Of the latter, slaves are altogether destitute of the deliberative faculty (*βουλευτικόν*) and are not † parts of the State, though they may be necessary to its existence. Others of the ruled again are parts of the State, but in some, as in women, the deliberative faculty is imperfect, while in others, as in children, it is undeveloped. None of these are citizens in the strict sense of the term, which properly signifies ‡ those who share in judgment and rule (*κρίσις καὶ ἀρχή*) functions for which the deliberative faculty is required. The meaning of the term citizen varies with different forms of government, but in the *πολιτεία* which Aristotle discusses as a good form of government, and as one practically possible, the government is in the hands of the whole adult male non-servile population, provided that they are not occupied with illiberal pursuits (*i.e.*, they do not belong to the class of the *βάναντοι*). This portion of the population rules over the rest, at least such I conceive to be Aristotle's view, in virtue of its superior political capacity. In many respects it resembles an aristocracy,§ but the proportion of the people sharing in the government is much larger than in the true aristocracy, and there may be much inequality in the virtue of those who rule the community, always provided it is not so great that the few good are better than the many taken in the aggregate. In ideal || forms of government such as true monarchy and aristocracy, where one

\* *Pol.*, I., 5, 7

† *Pol.*, III., 7 and 8.

‡ *Pol.*, III., 1, 4.

§ For instance, all take part in the government, and that simultaneously, for all are members of the assembly which is the sovereign body in the State, of which all magistrates, however exalted their office, are merely the ministers.

|| *Pol.*, III., 8, 1.

or several excel all others in virtue (*ἀρετή*) and in political capacity (*δύναμις πολιτική*), so as not in those respects to be comparable with them, the persons so pre-eminently fitted for rule must not be considered to form part of the State, and for such there can be no law, but all in a well ordered State should gladly obey them. Though Aristotle would probably not have considered such a state of things as likely to be found in a Greek city, he may very well have had in mind Alexander's conquests over nations, barbarous and therefore, in his eyes, fit subjects of a Greek ruler. With Aristotle then the consent of the subjects does not appear to be the foundation of government even in cases where the right to partake in rule extends to all who are qualified to be citizens.\*

Modern writers, on the other hand, seem to trace all rightful government either to the direct appointment of God or to the consent of the subjects. Hooker, for instance, after stating that all men have ever been taken as lords and lawful kings in their own houses, proceeds:† 'Howbeit over a whole grand multitude having no such dependency upon any one, and consisting of so many families as every politic society in the world, impossible it is that any should have complete lawful power but by consentment of men or immediate appointment of God; because, not having the natural superiority of fathers, their power must needs be usurped, and then unlawful, or if lawful, then either granted or consented unto them over whom they exercise the same, or else given extraordinarily from God, unto whom all the world is subject.' Hobbes and Locke similarly derive the right to exercise government from a covenant or agreement between the members of a multitude whereby each member resigns his natural powers and perfect freedom and submits to the control either, as in Hobbes,‡ of a man, or assembly of men, or, as in Locke, § of the community.

---

\* It must be noted that this has nothing to do with the question, which Aristotle does not appear to consider, why the minority should yield to the majority in such forms of government as the *πολιτεία* when there is a difference of opinion.

† *Leviathan*, Book II., Ch. xvii.

‡ Hooke's *Gal. Polity*, I., 10, 4.

§ Locke, *Two Treatises on Government*, Book II., Ch. vii., p. 87.

St. Thomas appears to take up a position intermediate between that of Aristotle and that of such modern writers. He seems usually to trace legitimate government either to the direct appointment of God or of superiors, or else to the consent of the people, express, as where the people elect their monarch or rulers, or tacit, as in the case of hereditary monarchs. While this is his general position he does not appear altogether to discard the Aristotelian view that some men are by nature rulers while others are naturally fitted to be ruled. It is true that too much stress must not be laid on the fact that in his Commentary on the Politics St. Thomas does not expressly differ from Aristotle when he discusses this subject, but yet we have to bear in mind that St. Thomas does occasionally dissent from 'the philosopher,' and from his whole method in his works I do not think he would pass over any important point of difference between Aristotle and himself, of which he was fully conscious. Again he writes in the *Summa*,\* quoting with approval from Augustine,† 'quod si populus sit bene moderatus, recte lex fertur qua toti populo liceat creare sibi magistratus, per quos respublica administratur. Porro si paulatim idem populus depravatus habeat venale suffragium, et regimen flagitiosis sceleratisque committat, recte adimitur populo talis potestas dandi honores, et ad paucorum bonorum redit arbitrium.' St. Thomas does not explain the meaning of this passage, and questions might be raised as to the exact force of the expression 'recte lex fertur,' as for instance, does it mean that there is a law-giver over the commonwealth by whose consent the people is allowed to choose its own magistrates. I do not think this is the meaning, but merely that under the constitution the people has the right of electing officers, and that it loses this right if it becomes corrupt. Whatever be the correct interpretation St. Thomas would certainly seem to indicate that the consent of the subjects is not always required to make a government lawful. Though St. Thomas would thus appear not to exclude the view that in some cases rule is justified by the superior fitness of the rulers, and though I have

\* *Sum.*, 1, 2 q., 97, 1, 0.

† *De Lib. Arbitr.*, I., ch. 6.

been unable to find any passage in which he expressly lays down any such view as that quoted above from Hooker, of the necessity of the consent of the governed to the exercise of rule over them, yet where, as in the *De Regimine*, he is discussing the question of the appointment of rulers, he appears only to have in his mind as legitimate forms of government those where the people elect their rulers or tacitly acquiesce in the government of hereditary monarchs, or else governments where the rulers are appointed by superiors. Cases of such appointments would be those we find in the Old Testament, where rulers are appointed directly by God, and St. Thomas doubtless had also present in his mind cases in which the Popes claimed feudal superiority over kings, as in Naples, Hungary, England and elsewhere, perhaps other instances also in which feudal superiors might claim the right to appoint subject rulers. That this is a correct statement of the practical conceptions of St. Thomas would appear to be the case from such passages as that in the *De Regimine*,\* where he says that a tyrant may rightly be deposed if the appointment of the king rests with the multitude, while if his appointment rests with a superior it is to him that recourse must be had. Here St. Thomas appears only to recognise two legitimate sources of the authority of the king, namely, the will of the people, or the appointment of a superior, and he takes no notice, as one would have expected him, if Aristotle's conception of the natural ruler had really been present to his mind, of the case of the king in virtue of natural superiority.†

That the views of St. Thomas are not more clearly expressed on this point is probably due to the very great influence exercised upon him by Aristotle, whose opinions clung to him, even where, as in this case, they appear never to have been quite brought in harmony with his other notions. He never formally raises an issue which would have compelled him minutely to examine his own ideas. It must also be noted

---

\* *De Reg.*, i. 6.

† Natural superiority would not exclude liability to error, and therefore the case where such a king degenerates into a tyrant may reasonably be considered.



that they were not necessarily inconsistent with one another, for just as Dante in the *Convito* \* appears to recognise as legitimate sources of authority, reason, the decree of an universal assembly, and the direct appointment of God, so St. Thomas might hold along with the last that natural superiority might in some cases be as legitimate a source of government as the consent of the people, or the appointment of superiors.

We have examined the views of St. Thomas regarding the sources of human government, and may now ask whether he admits the legitimacy of an absolute monarchy. To this the answer is in the negative, and we might almost have inferred it, had there been no other evidence, from the way in which St. Thomas describes a prince as one 'gerens vicem' or 'personam,' or 'habens curam' of the people he rules. St. Thomas appears to use the phrases 'gerens vicem' and 'gerens personam' almost indifferently to denote that one person is delegated by or represents another, and it is to be noted that he applies them not only to the relation between the prince and his people but also to the relation between the prince and God. Thus in one passage he says, † 'principes et praelati honorantur etiam si sint mali inquantum gerunt personam Dei et communitatis cui præficiuntur.' In another passage ‡ again he says that, as regards things entrusted to human jurisdiction, men 'gerunt vicem Dei.' In a free multitude § the authority of the prince to make laws depends on the fact that he 'gerit personam' of the people, or as he elsewhere says || 'to order anything for the common good is in the hands either of the whole multitude or of one "gerentis vicem" of the whole multitude,' and therefore he goes on to say 'to legislate pertains either to the whole multitude or to a public person who has the care (curam) of the multitude.' The prince thus is a delegate or representative of the people which is under his care, and this of itself involves a limit to his power.

Our knowledge of St. Thomas's views on this point do not, however, rest only on the way in which he uses these phrases.

\* *Convito*, Tr., IV., ch. 4.

† *Sum.*, 2, 2 q. 63, 3, 0.

‡ *Sum.*, 1, 2 q., 100, 8, 3.

§ *Sum.*, 1, 2 q., 97, 3, 3.

|| *Sum.*, 1, 2 q., 90, 3, 0.



In the *De Regimine* \* he allows that any form of government is right and just in which the rulers seek to promote the common good, but not otherwise. St. Thomas thus adopts Aristotle's test to distinguish legitimate and illegitimate governments, a test which is incompatible with the right of a monarch to govern his subjects at his own pleasure, for if he governs them with a view to his own good alone his rule becomes unjust and perverse, and he is no longer a king but a tyrant. Similarly the government of a few is an aristocracy, and good or an oligarchy and bad according as it does or does not conform to this test. Finally this test decides whether the government of the multitude is legitimate as in the polity, or illegitimate as in the democracy. Again St. Thomas in discussing † what form of government is the best, arrives at the conclusion that the rule of one man, in other words of a king, is to be preferred to any other, though aristocracies and polities are equally legitimate forms. The king, however, is not free from all restraints save the obligation to govern for the common good; for, not only is it the duty of those whose office it is to appoint a king, to select a man who is not likely to degenerate into a tyrant, but further, the government of the kingdom should be so arranged that all occasion for tyranny should be removed from the king after his appointment, and, lastly, his power should be so limited that he could not easily become a tyrant. Here we find the conception of a king very different from the ideal monarch of Aristotle, in whose case it would be wrong and absurd were his subjects to try to limit his power.

What, however, is to be done if the king disregards all restraints and does become a tyrant? Are the subjects quietly to submit and only call on God, the King of all, for deliverance, or may they lawfully resist? nay, may even private individuals slay the tyrant? St. Thomas distinguishes ‡ two cases, (1) where the multitude is entitled to appoint its king, (2) where the king is appointed by a superior.

The second case may be summarily disposed of, for here St. Thomas says recourse must be had to the superior by whom

---

\* *De Reg.*, I. 1.† *De Reg.*, I. 6.‡ *De Reg.*, I. 6. *Sum.*, II. 2, q. 104.

the king was appointed. The first case presents more difficulty. The question of obedience in general is discussed at some length in the *Summa*, and may be thus summarised so far as it bears on the present question. By the divinely appointed order of things,\* as in nature ('res naturales' as distinguished from human affairs) that what is inferior has to submit to the movements imposed upon it by what is superior. So in human affairs, by natural and divine law inferiors are bound to obey their superiors. This obedience men render † not of necessity like creatures devoid of reason but of their free will proceeding from their own choice (*proprio consilio*). Although ‡ obedience is justly due to the superior (*quadam necessitate iustitiae*) yet there are two cases in which subjects are not bound to obey their superiors, namely (1) where the order of a higher power stands in the way (2) where the order relates to a matter in which the inferior is not subject to the superior. It is to God only § that man is absolutely subject in all respects. To men he is only subject as regards bodily actions not arising out of the nature of the body. || Thus the soldier is bound to obey the general in matters relating to war, the slave is bound to obey his master in performing servile offices, the son is bound to obey in matters relating to the discipline of life and domestic matters (*disciplinam vitae et curam domesticam*) for we have all to do with the regulation of human acts and affairs. On the other hand, all men being equal as far as the nature of their bodies is concerned (*natura*), for instance in things pertaining to the sustenance of the body, and the begetting of children, slaves are not bound to obey their masters, nor children their parents, as regards marriage or virginity or other matters of this kind.

---

\* *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 104, 1, 0. I reproduce as far as possible the phraseology of St. Thomas.

† *Sum.*, 2, 2, q. 104, 1, 1.

‡ *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 104, 5, 0.

§ *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 104, 5, 2.

|| *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 104, 5, 0, *tenetur autem homo homini obedire in his quae exterius per corpus sunt agenda; in quibus tamen secundum; ea quae ad naturam corporis pertinent, homo homini obedire non tenetur sed solum Deo.*

In his Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, St. Thomas treats \* more specially of the obedience due by Christian subjects to their rulers. Obedience to them is no mere temporal but also a spiritual duty, for Christians are bound to obey their rulers so far as they derive their authority from God. This authority may not be from God either as regards the way in which it has been acquired or as regards the way in which it is used. 'As regards the first point, it may arise either from a personal defect because the ruler is unworthy, or it may be due to a defect in the mode of acquisition, because, for example, rule has been gained by violence or senistry or in some other illicit way. The first mentioned defect, namely, personal unworthiness, does not bar the acquisition of the right to rule (*jus praelationis*); and since rule formally † (*secundum suam formam*) always comes from God, for this reason obedience is due, and such rulers must, though unworthy, be obeyed by their subjects. The second defect, namely, wrongful acquisition, does prevent the right to rule arising.' A ruler, therefore, who has gained his position by wrongful means, may, when it is practically possible to do so (*cum facultas adest*), be resisted, unless he has subsequently acquired legitimate authority by the acquiescence of his subjects or by the appointment of a superior.

Authority may be abused, because what is ordered is contrary to the end for which government was ordained, and in this case, if a sinful act be ordered opposed to the virtue for the acquisition and preservation of which government was appointed, resistance becomes a duty. It may also be abused by orders being given in matters to which the authority does not extend, as were a master to call on a slave to pay tribute he is not bound to give. In this case obedience or disobedience is a matter of choice

So far is St. Thomas from admitting the divine right of

---

\* *Sen.*, 2, D. 44, q., 2, 2, 0. I have slightly condensed the passage.

† That is to say, power in its substance comes from God, but there may be accidental circumstances which prevent its being divine. *Cf.* the passage previously referred to from the Commentary on the Romans, chap. xiii., lec. 1.

rulers to unquestioning obedience from their subjects, that he declares \* that it is not to be accounted sedition if the rule of a tyrant is disturbed unless perchance in cases where it is so heedlessly done as to cause more mischief to the subject multitude by the ensuing disorders than was caused by the misrule of the tyrant. Nay more, it is rather the tyrant who is to be held guilty of sedition, who excites discord and troubles (seditiones) in the people subject to him, in order that he may rule it in greater security. Resistance,† however, St. Thomas insists, must be made to tyrants under public authority, and it must not be left to men's private judgment ‡ to decide when this is to be done.

As to the circumstances under which the right of resistance arises, his views may be thus summarised :—

(1) In the case of an usurper resistance is always lawful provided it would not entail greater evils to the people than the maintenance of the usurper's rule.

(2) A ruler who has the 'jus praelationis' may not be resisted unless

(a) He orders anything opposed to the end for which authority was ordained. Here resistance is sometimes a duty.

(b) He issues an order in some matter to which his authority does not extend. In this case the subject may obey or not at his pleasure.

St. Thomas's practical advice is,§ unless the tyranny becomes intolerable, rather to endure it than to incur the risk of dangers more burdensome than tyranny itself by attacking the tyrant. Among other dangers he points out are those of dissensions among the people, and the succession to one tyrant of another worse than the first.

We should here note St. Thomas's view of tyrannicide, which is very different from that expressed by John of Salisbury in

\* *Sum.*, 2, 2, q., 42, 2, 3.

† *De Reg.*, i. 6.

‡ An exception, however, would appear to be the case of a man unjustly condemned to death. He may lawfully resist unless resistance might cause great disorder. *Sum.*, 2, 2, q. 69, 4, 0.

§ *De Reg.*, i. 6.

the Polycraticus. In his commentary on the Sentences, it is true, St. Thomas in one passage,\* of which the meaning was much debated in later times, seems to yield a somewhat doubtful assent, at all events he does not expressly object to, the approval expressed by Cicero † of tyrannicide. St. Thomas even then limited his approval, if indeed he does approve, to cases where the tyrant acquired his government 'by violence against the will of his subjects, or with their forced consent, and when it is impossible to have resort to a superior by whom judgment could be passed on the invader.' The concluding words, 'that in that case he who to free his country kills a tyrant, is praised and receives a reward,' appear to be more than a mere gloss on Cicero's expressions. However this may be, it is certain that St. Thomas's final judgment on tyrannicide is one of disapproval, for in the *De Regimine* written several years later he writes ‡ 'It has seemed to some that if the excess of tyranny is intolerable it beseems brave men (ad fortium virorum virtutem pertinet) to slay the tyrant and to expose themselves to death in order to free the multitude. . . . This does not agree with the apostolic preaching, . . . and moreover, it would be dangerous to the multitude and to its rulers if men were to seek to slay the governors, even though tyrants, on the strength of their private judgment.'

While I have given above my reasons for holding that the king of whom St. Thomas speaks is not an absolute monarch, some notice should, perhaps, be taken of passages in his writings which might appear to bear a different construction. Thus he writes in the *Summa*,§ 'the prince is said to be free from subjection to the law (solutus a lege) so far as its coercive force is concerned, for properly speaking no one can be placed under compulsion by himself, but the law has no coercive force, saving from the power of the prince, and thus the prince is said to be free from subjection to law, because no one can pass sentence on him if he disobeys the law. . . . In another respect, too, the prince is above the law inasmuch as he can, if it is expedient, change the law and dispense with it

\* *Sen.*, 2, D. 44, q. 2, 2, 5.

† *De Officiis*, i. 6.

‡ *De Reg.*, i. 6.

§ *Sum.*, 1, 2, q. 96, 5, 3.



where the place or time demands it.' Again, in answer to an objection that to make laws pertains not only to kings but also to certain other rulers and even to the people, he replies, 'the philosopher (*i.e.* Aristotle) denominates the royal power from the principal function of the king which consists in making laws, and though this power belongs to others, it only belongs to them so far as they share in the royal power (*secundum quod participant aliquid de regimine regis*).' In the last passage of this kind I will notice he writes† of the prince as one 'cui est plenarie potestas publica commissa' and as one who having full power in the state may absolve guilty persons if the injured are willing, and if he sees the public good (*publica utilitas*) will not suffer from it.

The first passage, where St. Thomas speaks of the law as deriving its whole coercive power from the prince, might, if it stood alone, be interpreted as referring to an absolute monarch, but it has to be read in connection with his general treatment of the power of kings, which I have already dealt with. The phrases in which the prince is spoken of as 'gerens vicem' or 'gerens personam' of the people are specially important in this connection, for they show that St. Thomas holds that the prince has the legislative power as delegate or representative of the people. If, then, this power is in the nature of a trust, it cannot be unlimited, but must be subject to conditions, and that this is the case would appear from the terms in which St. Thomas writes regarding the power of dispensation. This power, he says,\* belongs to princes in order to prevent injury arising to the commonweal from strict compliance with the law in an individual case. Here the prince is evidently not regarded as exercising an irresponsible power, and in fact, if he were the sole author of law, it would seem unnecessary to say that he could dispense with law, when he might at any time alter it at his own will.

The second passage I referred to, in which St. Thomas writes that the power of legislation belongs to kings only, or to others in so far as they share in the royal power, does not

---

† *Sum.*, 2, 2, q. 67, 4, 0.

\* *Sum.*, 1, 2, q. 96, 53, and 60.



seem to mean more than that all who make laws must, like kings, be persons 'gerentes vicem' or 'personam' of the people.

The last passage expressly speaks of the public power as being entrusted (commissa), and that it is not unlimited appears from the fact that the prince can only pardon guilty persons if the injured are willing and the public good would not suffer from his clemency.

No doubt St. Thomas does imply a difference between the prince and his subjects as regards obedience to the law, but, as Dr. Antonius Basiliades suggests, it does not probably amount to more than this, that in the case of the king there is no regular authority to enforce obedience. St. Thomas was acquainted \* with the maxim of the Roman lawyers, 'quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem,' and it is probable that he was influenced by them in his view of the relation of the king to law. It is possible he would have expressed himself somewhat differently had he only been dealing with the relations of feudal monarchs to their subjects, but he does not appear to have intended to convey the idea of any absolute or unlimited power in monarchs either as regards legislation or as regards any other department of government.

As we have seen, St. Thomas admits the legitimacy of any form of government which aims at the common good, but he expresses a very strong preference for a monarchy. He argues out the question at some length in the *De Regimine*.† His arguments are, that without peace the whole of the advantages of society are lost, and therefore the main aim of the ruler of a multitude should be to secure to it the unity of peace. This can evidently be better done by that which is one in itself (i.e., an individual) than by a number of persons, who must, if they are to rule, be kept in some sort of union, and this union consists in an approximation to being one. (Uniri autem dicuntur plura per appropinquationem ad unum). Moreover, we see in nature, where all things are done in the best possible way, that it is always one that rules. The final

\* Note *Sum.*, 1, 2, q. 90, 1, 3.

† *De Reg.*, ch. 2-5.

example of this is that in the universe there is one God, the maker and ruler of all things. Now, works of art, and these include political institutions, are best when they most closely resemble nature, and therefore in the State there should be one ruler. Moreover, experience proves that those States which are not ruled by one man are torn by dissensions, while peace, justice, and abundance visit those States which are ruled by kings. Tyranny, indeed, which is also the rule of the State by one, is the worst possible form of rule, but it is no more likely to follow upon the rule of one than of many. St. Thomas recognises that it is a distinct disadvantage that in a monarchy the subjects are less intent on working for the public good than in such a republic as that of Rome, for they look upon this as not being their business but that of another. In a republic, on the other hand, every one looks upon the commonweal as being something which it is his duty to work for. To this cause is due the results effected by Rome in the days of the republic; but even here, he goes on to point out, dissensions at last arose, and worn out by civil wars, its citizens at last lost their liberty.

The precise nature of this monarchy is not indicated in the *De Regimine*, where it is merely stated \* that the power of the king should be so limited that he cannot easily become a tyrant. St. Thomas states his intention of showing later on how this is to be done, but unfortunately he never finished the work. In the *Summa* † he gives some indication of the measures to be taken. 'Two things,' he writes, 'must be attended to in a well-ordered State or people (*civitas, gens*), regarding the rule of its princes. The first point is that all should have some share in the government, for by this means peace is preserved in the people, and all love and defend such an arrangement. . . . The second point depends on the form of government, for, as mentioned by the Philosopher in 3rd *Politics*, there are several forms, but the principal are kingship, in which one rules because of his excellence (*secundum virtutem*); and aristocracy, that is to say, the rule of the best, in which a few

---

\* *De. Reg.*, I., 6.

† *Sum.*, I., 2, q. 105, 1, 0.

selected for their excellent rule (*secundum virtutem*). Therefore the best arrangement of governors in any state or kingdom is that in which one is at the head appointed for his excellence who presides over all, while under him are rulers selected for their excellence, and yet the government belongs to all, because the rulers are elected by all and all are eligible.' He goes on to say that in this form of government are combined 'monarchy, as one presides, aristocracy, as many rule selected for their excellence, and democracy, inasmuch as the rulers may be chosen from all classes (*in quantum ex popularibus possunt eligi principes*), and the election of the rulers is in the hands of the people. This was the form of government appointed by the divine law, for Moses and his successors governed the people, each of them individually (*quasi singulariter*), ruling all. Seventy-two elders were elected for their excellence. . . . and this furnished the aristocratic element; while the democratic element was furnished by the arrangement that these were elected from all the people . . . and by the people.'

The explanation St. Thomas gives of the Jewish constitution before the period of the kings, though not unreasonable, is certainly not obvious, and there can be little doubt that it must have been suggested to him by the contemporary political conditions. This is important as it may possibly indicate that he was in sympathy with the movement of his time, as shown in England from the time of Magna Charta, in the growth of representative government, to which Frederic II. also yielded in his constitutions. The passage also indicates his preference for elected as against hereditary monarchs, a preference which he defends in his commentary on the *Politics*, on the ground that election generally ensures the appointment of a better man. On the other hand, electors may quarrel, or they may be bad, and make an ill choice. The advantages of hereditary monarchy are, that habit helps greatly to make subjection tolerable, and therefore it is easy for the son to secure the obedience of people ruled by his father while he is yet alive, and further, it is hard to submit to the rule of one who yesterday was merely an equal.

---

\* *Pol.*, Book III., Ch. xiv., p. 49, 1, H.

To sum up, St. Thomas prefers an elective monarch, supreme, but not absolute, and there is no trace in his writings of the theory of the divine right of kings, or of non-resistance, as taught in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Finally, and this is a point to which I hope to return another time, St. Thomas utterly ignores the claim of the emperor, and I have not found a single line in his writings to indicate that he thought any other universal ruler of the whole Christian world was required than the Pope.

A. J. CARLYLE.

---

## SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

---

GERMANY.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (October, November, December).—Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach heads the table of contents of the first of these three numbers with the opening chapters of a charming story, 'Rittmeister Brand,' in which she appears at her very best, and displays those distinctive qualities—that genuine pathos, and that no less genuine but subdued humour—which have made her so popular amongst lovers of light literature. The novelette has only two parts, and is brought to a close in the November number.—Still more broadly humorous is 'Plappermäulchen,' a legend which Herr Hans Hoffmann has gathered on the shores of the Baltic, and which he relates with much skill and artistic effect.—General von Verdy du Vernois continues and concludes his reminiscences of the Franco-German War. His last instalment is particularly interesting, and is devoted to his personal recollections of the siege of Paris.—Herr Paul Bailleu contributes an article on Heinrich von Sybel. Though as much an obituary notice as a critical essay, it is sober and well balanced, and, on the whole, as fair an estimate of the historian as could be expected from a contemporary and a compatriot.—Admirers of Gottfried Keller will feel thankful to Herr Baechtold for communicating another batch of the novelist's letters.—An interesting paper by Konrad Plath contains an account of an imperial palace of Charlemagne's at Nimègue, and is based on personal researches conducted on the spot by the writer.—The November part concludes 'Rittmeister Brand,' and also the selection from Keller's correspondence.—To this, and also to the next number, Herr Julius Rodenberg contributes 'Erinnerungen aus der Jugendzeit.' These recollections of his early years are chiefly devoted to the memory of Heinrich Marschner.—The Russian writer, Michael Saltykow, is taken by Herr Theophil Pezold for the subject of a very interesting and very instructive paper. The author not only gives a striking and vigorous sketch of Saltykow himself, but incidentally throws considerable light on some aspects of Russian life.—One of the most important contributions of the quarter is the very erudite, yet thoroughly interesting, paper which Herr Hermann Oldenberg modestly styles 'A Study in the History of Religion,' but which is really based on an exceptionally profound knowledge

of the religion of the Veda and Buddhism.—The December part contains the final instalments of several articles begun in November. Of the new matter, the most interesting and readable item is the essay in which Herr Franz Xaver Kraus deals with Petrarch's letters.—All the numbers have the ordinary supplements in the way of political, literary, dramatic, and other letters.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN (No. 1, 1896).—Professor J. Weiss of Marburg continues here his article, the first part of which appeared in No. 2 of last year's issue, entitled 'Paulinische Probleme.' He proposed in it to consider certain difficulties that face the student of the Pauline Epistles, and to endeavour to aid in the solution of them. In that first section he dealt with the chronological order of the Epistles, with special reference to Dr. Carl Clemen's recent work (1893) 'Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe.' He examined very minutely the *data* furnished by the Acts of the Apostles as to Paul's visits to Jerusalem; the assertions and references in the Epistles themselves as to the controversies that arose between the Palestinian and the Hellenic Jews—'der antijudaistische Streit;' and then Paul's doctrinal teaching. Here he pursues this latter theme, discussing, with truly German minuteness, the favourite formula of the Apostle 'ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ'—what it signified in the primitive church, and what in its frequent usage by St. Paul.—Professor Julius Köstlin follows with an elaborate dissertation on 'Das Bischoftum in der Brüdergemeinde und die Katholische und anglikanische Idee des apostolisch-bischöflichen Succession.' It is an interesting historical review of the importance attached to the idea of Apostolical Succession in the more important branches of the Protestant Church, but the greatest part of the article is devoted to the place this dogma has held in the Moravian Church, and the history of the claims of that Church to an unbroken and unquestionable succession of properly consecrated bishops.—Herr F. B. L. Roth furnishes two biographical sketches, the first of Nicolaus Maurus, who was associated with Luther at Wittenberg, and the author of some hymns and psalm-renderings, the most celebrated of which perhaps was his version of Psalm cxiv., 'Da Israel aus Egypten zoch;' the other is of Leonhard Brunner, an adherent of Zwingle, and a writer of considerable note in his day.—A series of short, but valuable, articles—they are twelve in number—follow on several interesting subjects.—Herr Gustav Schläger, adopting the chronological order of the Synoptic Gospels in favour in some quarters, viz., Mark, Luke, Matthew,



and holding that the compiler of Matthew was dependent on Luke for some of his narratives, gives a series of words and phrases in common to both, but which, to his mind, seem natural to Luke, and foreign to Matthew.—Herr Pfarrer Arnold Rüegg gives a very ingenious reason for the abrupt conclusions of St. Luke's Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, and for the recapitulation of the Ascension narrative in the opening verses of the Acts. Luke devotes twenty-three verses to the one appearance of the risen Jesus which he records, and compresses the story of the Ascension into two verses. At the close of the Acts Paul's residence in Rome for two years is summed up again in two verses. Why this abruptness? and why the more elaborate narrative of the Ascension at the beginning of the Acts? It arises, Herr Rüegg thinks, from the form which books then had to take by reason of the size of the papyrus rolls at the disposal of writers. Of these rolls there was a minimum size, and a maximum. Whichever size might be adopted the writer was limited by the extent of his roll, and if he came to the end of it, and did not wish to occupy another entire roll he was compelled to summarize what more he was anxious to say in as brief a space as was still at his command. If he wished to continue his narrative on to another roll, the necessarily abbreviated narrative at the close of the first roll would naturally be expanded at the beginning of the second. He gives here abundant proofs, drawn from Theodore Virt's work, 'Das antique Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur,' of the reasonableness of his contention.—The other articles are 'Einige Beobachtungen zum Codex Beza;' 'An Exposition of 1 Cor. xiii., 13;,' 'Giebt das Neue Testament sichere geschichtliche Bezeugung für die Davidsche Abstammung Jesu von Nazareth;,' and several short papers on points connected with Luther and his writings; and on other matters.

#### RUSSIA.

VOPROSI PHILOSOFII I PSYCHOLOGII (Questions Philosophical and Psychological), begins its 29th No. with a lengthy translation from Laurentius Valla, of his Tractate on 'Pleasure and True Blessing.' The translator M. M. Korelin names it an Ethical Tractate which we have hardly discovered from the contents, the whole being an unblushing defence of Hedonism at any cost. The principal speaker, Beccadelli, is an out and out Epicurean. His reading of the relation between Tarquinius and Lucretia is quite characteristic. Beccadelli does not deny that Tarquinius acted dishonourably, which is rather a pretty way of

excusing rape; but Lucretia was hard and unreasonable, and her suicide senseless! Lorenzo Valla, we believe, has been cited by Sir William Hamilton for some of his logical views; but we suppose, these were his more mature works, and the tractate before us truly shows the looseness of the Renaissance, such as we have it in the well-known contemporary of Dante, Boccaccio. There is a good deal of hostility to Aristotle, which converges in the pages of the Tractate, as directed apparently against the right-mindedness of that philosopher.—The second article of the number is on the 'Consciousness of God and the Knowledge of God,' with reminiscences of the Ontological proof of the Being of God. The author, Prof. Kozloff, begins by saying that before coming to deal with the substantial part of his article, he feels it necessary to deal with several points, without which he thinks the article will not be well understood. First of all, he deems it necessary to discriminate between the two terms, Consciousness and Knowledge. These in Russ run closer together than in our English terms; the first *soznanie* being equivalent to Self-Knowledge, the *znanie* to Knowledge. Prof. Kozloff has previously sought to vindicate this difference, but here he thinks it needs to be specially dealt with, in order to the better understanding of his article. He recalls the utterances of the philosopher Teichmüller on the subject, but seeks to deal with the points on their own ground. The conscious and the unconscious are not properly distinguished from one another save quantitatively. The unconscious does not mean more than a certain very slight degree of consciousness, which for us or any such-like beings exists as if it were not. Absolute unconsciousness is nowhere to be found. All that proceeds in the life of different beings unconsciously, may also in a certain way become conscious, for in the eternal, timeless evolution of living beings, it stands to reason that the process must go forward through all possible degrees of development. It would be more convenient to sub-divide the term consciousness into *original*, *immediate*, and *common*, on one side; and the produced, the mediate and the complex on the other. Only the first is distinguished from Knowledge, for the produced, mediate, and complex include also Knowledge as a part of consciousness. Or, in other words, the original, immediate and common 'Consciousness,' are consciousness in the strict and narrow sense. Knowledge, again, as the complex consciousness, is consciousness in the broad sense, to wit, intuitions, thoughts, concepts, etc. For as Knowledge naturally prefers the conception of being, so consciousness, the pure and individual, is that which ought to be named being. In the reception of consciousness, there is merely an arbitrary repetition in

the same order and with the same impression as before. The author proceeds to lay down certain principles in regard to consciousness, such as that in consciousness, in the narrow sense, there is no affirmation of truth or falsehood, taken predicatively. This seems doubtful, for the fact of existence may be asserted of its contents. Our author next proceeds to discuss the relation of consciousness to the *ego*, which Prof. Kozloff names not improperly, the substance of consciousness, and yet he tells us that the Positivists and Sceptics constantly endeavour to reduce the *ego*, this substantial element in consciousness, to a mere empty word without reality. In the second place, he holds that consciousness is the function or activity of the *ego*, the activities of feeling or will, etc., but again, as in the former case, the reality of this function is often doubted. Prof. Kozloff thus sums up the results of his thoughts, 'on the Consciousness and the Knowledge of God,' in the following three positions. (1) The reality or actual being of Him whom men name God, and which in the most general expression of it, is something most true of the reality of which *we are immediately assured or have an immediate consciousness*. Yet he admits the difficulty of fully realizing this great conception. It is, as it were, some great conception or series of conceptions which we have partially forgotten, but yet loom before us, as something which must be remembered. (2) It would be a mistake to look for such objects under conditions of space and time with which the consciousness of God might be correlated; (3) To form conceptions concerning the real properties and activities of God, we are able, better than all, by means of our consciousness, concerning our individual substance and properties and activities, given (or revealed) to the consciousness of each individual in acts, feelings, volitions, movements, sensations, thoughts. In the continuation of his paper the author will take up the ontological proof of the being of God.—M. Vladimir Solovieff follows on this, with an article 'On the supposed elements of correct conduct,' being a critique of the different views of Eudæmonism. The morally good is determined by the reason as right in a broad sense or as obligatory on all. This idea of the good inwardly embracing all and logically necessary is shown in a real sense to be lacking in universality and necessity. The good as an ideal *norm* of the will does not in fact, run parallel to the *beneficial*, as an object actually wished for. The rule is obligatory, but in the first place, all do not wish it, as that which ought to be; in the second place, amongst those wishing the good, all are not able to reach it practically, on account of the evil tendencies of their own natures; and finally, in the third place, some few arrive at the conquest

of good over evil in their own natures, persons charitable, righteous, and holy, but are yet powerless by their good to conquer the evil in which the whole world lies around them.—The last paper in the general section of the 'Questions' is by Prince Serge Troubetskoy, and is a comparison of the two great Christian principles of Ethics and Doctrine or Dogma. It starts by a comparison of the Sermon on the Mount, as spoken by Christ Himself, and the Nicene Creed,—the one as the new law of conduct which rather supposes faith and takes it for granted than formulates it, the other as the determination of the historical fact, the dogmatic conclusions, the metaphysical terms in which its contents are cast, and which would not have been understood by the first teachers of the new doctrine. Ethics have no place here. The Sermon on the Mount is related to the community of Syrian Christians, the Nicene symbol to the world of Greek philosophy. The contrast is very evident. And if any one thinks adequately to explain this contrast by affirming that the one is a Sermon, the other a Symbol, it will be enough to follow this by the remark that the question just lies in this: why an ethical sermon stands at the head of the religious teaching of Jesus Christ? while a metaphysical symbol stands at the head of the Christianity of the fourth century—this is in itself a problem calling for research. Hatch begins his remarkable book on the influence of the Greek ideas and usages upon the Christian Church, with these very words. He explains the contrast between the teaching of Christ and the form which Christianity received in the Byzantine epoch, wholly by the influence of Greek culture, Greek philosophy, a Pagan conception of the world, faith in the religious customs of that Hellenizing Society, which took Christianity in its external form, substituting it for their previous state, religion. Such an explanation of the religious construction and teaching of the Byzantine epoch has not been given previously to Hatch,—the work of the English historian giving himself to trace out the whole way by which Hellenism permeated Christianity, is distinguished by its greater thoroughness and fulness of argumentation, it is perhaps marked out by greater onesidedness comparatively than the labours of his predecessors. The Tübingen School had explained the origin of Catholic Christianity by its earliest theology, being a compromise between Judaism and Gentilism, by the reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christians as parties in the original Christian Church. But in fifteen years this fell asunder, and another conception became prevalent, that of Ritschl in his '*Entstehung d. alt-Catholischen Kirche*,' which has had a wide acceptance, and has been received by multi-

tudes of followers. Here a far greater influence has been ascribed to the Apostle of the Gentiles, who called in the religion of the Old Testament which serves as a ground and basis of the New Testament revelation which has been followed up by Harnack and others. It is remembered that Paul claims to be a Pharisee, that as such he believed before he was assured of the resurrection of Christ in the doctrine of the resurrection. It is certain that Ritschl is right in affirming that Paul could not have been understood by the Greek element alone! The Hebrew world-conception also served as a basis, and the doctrine of Paul has the resurrection as a fundamental conception for the whole Church. Here the Greek idealism is supplemented and strengthened by the Messianism of the Hebrews. The Greek philosophical Christians, as Athenagorus and Origen, held fast to the faith of the resurrection, which separated them from the Gentiles.—The rest of the number is occupied by reviews and other bibliographical matter.

*ITALY.*

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (October 1-15th.)—‘Medical Mecænas and Clients, or episodes of the youth of Poliziano,’ is an interesting paper by Isidoro del Lungo.—In an easy narrative style, Emilio Pindua gives an account of the dukes of Savoy and kings of Sardinia.—J. Valetta writes a long and learned article on the Lyric Theatre of Italy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.—Professor Mariano contributes an important article on the Episcopalian Constitution of the Christian Church, which is finished in the following number. In these first two chapters he treats of the temporal and ideal origin of the episcopate.—Enrico Barone tells the story of General von Moltke, founding his sketch on Zanelli’s recent work.—V. Malamani describes the eighteenth century fashions at Venice, quoting his facts from a French book.—L. Luzatti has a valuable paper on Credit and Co-operation in Italy during the last thirty years.—V. Sansonetti writes on the personal responsibility of government ministers, and the article 47 of the Italian Statute.—A. G. Barrile commences a paper on the first Italian drama.—Prof. Mariano, closing the paper in the previous number, says that the historic and social conditions of modern times, and the moral direction in which men’s minds are being led, will cause the series of events he has described to seem a mere play of fancy. But to thinkers it may seem that the facts pointed out may serve to prepare a more perfect plan for future humanity, and a plainer and wider path by which to reach a purer atmosphere.—G. Imbert tells the story of Francesco Redi, a courtier and ‘primitive man’ of the seventeenth



century.—(November, 1-15th.)—A considerable portion of this number is devoted to a memoir of the late Professor Bonghi and his literary and political life, by Professor d'Ovideo, who has an intimate knowledge of his subject, and treats it with affectionate warmth, and perfect justice and appreciation.—Massiano Tortelli contributes a monograph on Louis Pasteur, doing full justice to the great man's scientific works and aim.—E. De Paolo describes university autonomy according to Bacelli's project, which he holds to be very promising.—D. Guoli discusses the teaching of Italian literature in schools; and Raffaele De Cesare has many important things to say concerning the new conflict between Church and State.—E. Massi criticises some recent writers on Tasso.—A new novel, entitled 'The Lieutenant in the Lancers,' is commenced by G. Rovetta.—L. Nocentini has a paper on the Spirit of Association among the Chinese; and Enrico Cocchia contributed a study on Coriolanus and the origin of poetry in Rome.—G. Cimbali has a paper on Nicola Spedalieri.

LA RASSEGNA NAZIONALE (Oct. 1-15th.)—The number commences with the revised text of the lecture given by Paolo Bellezza at the Milan Philological Society last April on 'William Gladstone and his studies in Italian literature.' Premising that it must seem difficult to speak of Mr. Gladstone and leave aside his political and financial qualities, the lecturer describes the genius impressed on all Mr. Gladstone said or wrote; his vast knowledge of literature, which caused him to embellish his speeches with gems of classical quotation. Mr. Gladstone had a great preference for Italian literature, and an especial admiration for Dante. After Dante came Leopardi, whom Mr. Gladstone called 'one of the most extraordinary men of the nineteenth century.' After Leopardi the Italian writer best known to Mr. Gladstone was Manzoni. The great resemblance between Manzoni and Mr. Gladstone has been pointed out by the late Professor Bonghi, who once said that Gladstone filled in politics the place filled by Manzoni in literature; the first elevated the tone of politics in England, and the latter the tone of literature in Italy. Alluding to the fact that Gladstone is no poet, Signor Bellezza quotes the translation of Cowper's famous hymn into Italian by Mr. Gladstone, and says it would have been better done by a schoolboy. But such weak verses may be pardoned to one who loved Italy much. Bellezza goes on to point out the various ways in which Mr. Gladstone showed his love of Italy and Italian literature.—Grabinski's paper on Dionigi Pasquier is continued.—Camillo Sapelli furnishes a story entitled 'An Audacious



Theft.'—C. Calzi contributes a polemical paper on 'Religion and Philosophy in Italian Schools.'—G. Mercalli gives a scientific account of the present eruption of Vesuvius, which began on the 3rd of July last.—After a paper on Italian exhibitions, and a translation of Mrs. Craik's novel 'Two Marriages,' we have here an angry article, by A. Soliman, on the fables taught to children. He calls it a massacre of the innocents, inculcating false beliefs.—F. Donaver gives a summary of the very interesting book, *The Life of Count Arese*.—F. Massino contributes verses on Filippo Neri.—G. Secretant pleads for Sardinia.—E. Lamina discusses Guido Orlandi and the school of the 'dolce stil novo.'—(November, 1st to 16th.)—A. Linaker describes an inedited work of Lambruschini on Religious Education.—E. A. Poperti contributes an article on Montana, and F. Salvatori writes a laudatory criticism on G. A. Cesareo's *Gl' Inni*.—Follows an interesting description of a visit to Montelupo and the Ambrogian Lunatic Asylum, by Mario Foresi.—A. Astori discusses the Clergy and Socialism, saying that the mission of the clergy ought to be the solving of the social problems that torment modern Italy.—A curious little story, founded on the well-known story of Caspar Hauser, is contributed by Luigi d' Isengard.—L. Grottanelli commences a kind of chronicle, entitled 'Claudia de' Medici,' relating to events and documents of Urbino princes; the paper is continued in following numbers.—A. Zaido reviews the 'Life of Fedele Lampertico,' by the poet Giacomo Zanella.—P. S. writes on the peril of anarchy, apropos of the late elections.—E. Basta commences a story 'Caterina the Fanatic,' founded on a tradition prevalent in Upper Piedmont.—There is besides a short paper on 'Army Arrangements,' by General Revel, and some notes on the 'Memoirs of Father Curci,' by G. Morando.—(December 1st.)—G. Marcotti contributes some interesting impressions of Bordeaux during the late exhibition, giving much information about the congresses, the protection of infants, the wives, and the habits of the people, etc.—P. S. continues his discussion on Italian political parties in a paper on the 'New Conservative Party.'—G. Vidari commences a treatise on the evolution which the romance has gone through since the days of Sir Walter Scott. From the historical romance of that time, he says, we have gone through the social romance, and arrived at the naturalistic and experimental romance, which reached its culminating point in the works of Zola. But all the germs of modern romance may be found hidden in such a work as Manzoni's *Promessi Sposi*, and others of that epoch.—E. Basla's 'Catherine the Fanatic' is continued in a bright narrative style.

EMPORIUM (November)—a large portion of this number is devoted to Robert Burns, Dr. Ullisse Ortensio writing an excellent memoir of the poet. The article is well illustrated, and Dr. Ortensio adds translations of 'Tam o' Shanter,' 'The wounded hare,' and 'To a mouse,' which, though faithful to meaning, lose all charm, and sound prosaic in their unrhymed and imperfectly versified Italian form.—'Neera,' writing on culture among artists, names Burne Jones, Leighton, Watts, and Alma Tadema, as erudite in the extreme.—B. G. contributes a short account of Lewis Fairfax Muckley and his works.—Parmenio Bettoli has a paper on hunting, describing the sport from the earliest times. The article is richly illustrated.

NAPOLI NOBILISSIMA (November)—'A typographical plan of Naples in 1566,' by M. Schipa.—'The Royal Tombs in the Naples Cathedral,' by Prof. de la Ville sur-Yllon.—'The Street Toledo; the Churches,' by A. Colombo.—'The Regina Margherita School in the ex-convent of S. Teresa,' by G. Ceci.—'The Crocodile Ditch at Castelnuovo,' by G. Amalfi.

GIORNALE DANTESCO (Year III., Nos. 5 and 6).—'The balcony of the bear,' by G. Franciosi.—'Dante's Rome,' by G. De Leonardia.—'The Guide of Dante and Boezio,' by R. Murari.—'Dante's Lucifer,' by A. Menza.—'Some words and methods of Dante,' by S. Prato.

LA VITA ITALIANA (November).—'The Compass of Flavio Gioia.'—'To young students of literature.'—'Memoirs of vanished Roman Society.'—'Art in Piedmonte.'—'Perugia.'—'The 2nd November in Rome.'—'Memoirs of Ruggero Bonghi.'

IL PENSIERO ITALIANO (November)—'The French æsthetic naturalist.'—'The duty of the Upper Classes towards the Workman's Productive Associations.'—'Letters of Joseph Mazzini.'—'The Educative School.'—'Literature which is Nonsense.'—'Maragliano's Sierotaphie.'

GIORNALE DEGLI ECONOMISTA (December)—'The Monetary Market.'—'The Agricultural Crisis in England.'—'The solution of the problem of the Unemployed.'—'Employees in Savings-banks.'—'Providence.'

L'ECONOMISTA (November) contains: 'Tributary Reform.'—'The Congress of Bologna.'—'The Reform in Railway Fares in France.'—'Communal Societies.'—'The state of Foreign Legislation on Labour Accidents.'—'The Question of Military Expenses.'—'The state of the Treasury at the end of September, 1895.'—'International Commerce of Italy in 1895.'—'The Colonisation of Abyssinia.'—(December 1st)—'Finance.'—'The equalisation of the Land-tax.'—'The Reform of Railway Fares in Italy.'—'The Financial Report by Sonnino.'

## FRANCE.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS (No. 4, 1895).—M. Aug. Audollent's 'Bulletin Archeologique de la Religion Romaine' for the year 1894 has the first place in this number. As usual we have a very complete, if succinct, summary of the discoveries made last year by the Archæological Societies that are busy excavating in various parts of Italy, and of the 'memoirs' as to their work, which are published by these Societies, or by individuals connected with them. These 'Bulletins' form a very valuable feature of this *Revue*. They keep its readers *en rapport* with all 'the fresh light' as it comes 'from the monuments,' and which is dispelling so marvellously the obscurity which has clouded so long the early religions of Italy, of Greece, and of Egypt. These Bulletins embrace the archæological work carried on in various countries, are always full of interesting details, and are most helpful to all who are interested in the religious history of humanity. It is only, of course, in so far as the pick and spade prove helpful to the elucidation of primitive religious faiths and cults, that their revelations are noticed here.—M. Alfred Millioud continues and completes his translation of Ki-you's history, or summary of the story, of the founding of the Catholic Convent, or Monastery rather, at Kyoto in Japan, by permission of the Emperor Nobouanga (1568-1585 A.D.), and the influence it exercised during that Emperor's reign. Here we have the story of its suppression, and a summary (from another hand than Ki-you's, though attached to his 'History') of the doctrines taught by the Christians. We have also some explanatory notes in the form of Appendices from the translator and editor, M. Millioud.—M. A. Laune gives a very interesting account of the French translation of the Bible by M. Lefèvre, of Etaples, which was printed in 1530, and which had so much influence in moulding the character of French Protestantism at the period of the Reformation. The early history of this work has been sadly overlooked by scholars, and its authorship has been even assigned to others. M. Laune is here anxious to vindicate (as he has done elsewhere) Lefèvre's claims, and to restore him to his rightful place in the rôle of Biblical scholarship. He gives us here a brief account of his literary labours, and then describes the circumstances under which his translation of the Bible was undertaken, the reception given to it, and the opposition it aroused in the centres of Catholic authority. It was published in instalments as they were completed. They were rapidly bought up as they appeared. In nine months four editions of the New Testament were issued. The translation of the Psalms

was no less popular. But the Protestant character of his work aroused hostility to it, and the Sorbonne and Parliament took energetic measures to arrest its progress. Lefèvre fled to, and found refuge in, Strassburg. But there he continued his work, and published an edition of it in 1534, with marginal notes of a critical character, after the example of, and at the same time profiting by the edition published by, Robert Estienne, in 1532. M. Laune's article deserves the attention of all who wish to acquaint themselves with the rise and growth of French Protestantism, and with the early history of the Antwerp Polyglott.—M. Jean Reville calls attention to the Congress of Religions which is being mooted to be held in 1900 in Paris, after the example of that recently held in Chicago.—A large number of reviews of important works follows, but the customary *chronique* is absent.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS (No. 5, 1895).—M. E. Blochet furnishes another instalment of 'Unedited Pehlevi Texts.' Those given here are two passages from a recently discovered edition of the so called *Bundehesh*, a copy of which has come into his hands, and which he is now translating and editing for publication. This edition, it seems, is considerably larger than the copy of it brought to France by Anquetil Duperron, in 1761, and which has been the standard text up till now. M. Blochet does not regard even this recently discovered edition as complete, for, he says, there are references in it to passages of the work which are not to be found in this version. Anquetil's copy contains 34 chapters; this edition contains 42. In a prefatory note or 'Introduction' M. Blochet discusses some interesting questions as to the *Bundehesh*—why it has been so called, and when it was written—and indicates some of the difficulties that beset the translation of it, such as the uncertainty of the text here and there, and the multiplicity of possible renderings open to the student of the Pehlevi text. The two passages he translates—the text of which in Pehlevi is given—are accompanied with a number of explanatory notes.—The second article in this number bears the title, 'Du rôle de la psychologie dans les études de mythologie comparée.' It is by M. M. Marillier, and forms the Introduction to his translation (into French) of Mr. A. Lang's work, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, just issued. M. Marillier shows himself in this Introduction to be in fullest sympathy with the 'Anthropological School' of mythological interpretation, one of whose ablest and most versatile leaders Mr. Lang is universally acknowledged to be, and takes occasion here to point out that while Mr. Lang brings forward in rich abundance the facts on which

the anthropological school bases its position—that similar stages of human development display similar intellectual products—he does not enter into the psychological cause of this with any marked earnestness. This fault our author here seeks to make up for, or at least to call attention to, so that the subject may receive the study which it deserves.—M. E. Montet, the Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Geneva, has been visiting South America, seeking to recruit his health, and now gives the readers of this *Revue*—as a foretaste of a work he is about to issue as the fruits of his travels—a few random notes, as they might be called, of what he has observed as to the religious condition of the inhabitants of Brazil and the Argentine Republic. The religious indifference of the great mass of the cultured classes there seems to have impressed him very strongly, and some of the superstitious usages of the less cultured and the ‘blacks,’ which he records, are certainly curious enough.—M. Jean Réville gives a very interesting sketch of the character, work, and influence of Erasmus and Luther on the trend of thought in the time of the Reformation; and shows how their characteristic differences of spirit and temperament, fostered by their early life and environments, told on their respective labours in the common effort after reform, and determined their special spheres.—M. Regnaud criticises his recent critic who in No. 3 of this year’s issue of this *Revue* dealt somewhat severely with his most recently expressed views on the meaning of the Vedic hymns. The *Chronique* here makes up for the omission of last number, and brings us up to date.

REVUE DES RELIGIONS (No. 5, 1895.)—‘Japan from the religious point of view,’ is the subject of an article from the pen of M. Castonnet des Fosses, Vice-president of the Société de Géographie Commerciale of Paris. It is only the first part of the article that appears here, and it occupies the place of honour. Japan has, by its recent military achievements, challenged universal attention, and roused universal interest. Numerous works and magazine articles have already done much to gratify public curiosity as to the origin, history, and institutions of the Japs, and although their religious beliefs and customs have not been overlooked, still there is room for a specialist’s voice to be heard on the subject yet. Religion, our author here rightly reminds us, plays a rôle of the first order in moulding a nation’s character and shaping its destinies, and so, if we are to understand Japan and its people, we must not study them from the military and economic point of view only, but also from the religious. That is what M. Cas-



tonnet de Fosses sets himself to help us to do. A brief *resumé* is given of what is known, or has been inferred from the archaeological and pre-historic remains found in the islands, as to the ethnic origin or affinities of the somewhat mixed population over which the Mikado rules, and of its history. That history properly begins about the eighth century, B.C. Everything in their chronicles, prior to that period, is uncertain, and even after that there is a large amount of fable woven into the tissue of Japanese history. Shintoism seems to have been the early national form of religion. All Japanese writers are unanimous in affirming this, and they date its origin as coeval with the creation, and affirm its transmission and observance since to be untarnished by foreign admixture. M. C. des Fosses makes short work of these pretensions. The forms of the Shinto faith date in reality from about the sixth century, B.C. The religious ideas of the Japanese were, prior to that, of a very primitive order. There was no definite idea of a soul or of a future life, though vague notions of a kind of Hades come out in some of the traditionary lore gathered up in later times. There was no element of morality blending with religious duty, and there does not seem to have been any regulated cult. But under the influence of Buddhism, and through intercourse with the Chinese, Shintoism took a distinct and ordered form. The details as to this will likely form the next part of our author's paper.—M. l'Abbé Peisson continues—this is the sixth article—his elaborate exposition of Confucianism. Here he deals with the teaching of Confucius as to the invisible world of spirits, and the modes of honouring, pleasing, and propitiating them, criticising, and, when he thinks necessary, correcting the opinions of several modern exponents of this part of the system, and specially here, Dr. Albert Reville. He treats also of the modes of divination, and of the modifications which have crept in through the more enlightened culture of the sages in more recent times. In the elaborate and cosmopolitan chronique—it occupies fifty-six pages of the *Revue*—the literature of the religions of China and Japan also receives a large share of attention.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (October, November, December).—Thomas-Robert Bugeaud de la Piconnerie, Marshal of France, Duke of Isly, the true conqueror of Algeria, may fairly be considered as one of the most striking figures that have appeared in France during the nineteenth century; and as such he is certainly not undeserving of the very able essay in which M. Victor Du Bled recalls his life and his achievements to a generation for which his name has ceased to be the

household word that it was to the men of fifty years ago. Nor does the writer limit himself to a narrative of half-forgotten, but not unknown facts. From a hitherto unpublished correspondence, he has been able to gather details which throw new light upon Bugeaud's career, and show him as he really was, not faultless, indeed, but sincere, honourable, and endowed with talents which did not fall far short of genius.—In 'Papin et la Machine à Vapeur,' M. Berthelot sketches the life and work of the man whom his countrymen look upon as the inventor of the steam-engine, or, perhaps it would be more correct to say of a steam-engine, and who, undoubtedly built a steamboat as early as 1707.—Two interesting literary essays are contributed by M. Brunetière, and the Vicomte Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé respectively. The former deals with the causes which have led to cosmopolitanism in literature; the latter shows Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* to be one of the most typically English works in our literature.—In a paper which, though published in October, fits in remarkably with recent events, M. G. Valbert, discusses the Emperor William II. and the way in which he understands personal government.—In the mid-monthly number, one of the most generally readable articles is that in which M. le Comte de Turenne recalls the tragic details of that ghastly episode in the history of the Mormons, known as the Mountain Meadow Massacre.—M. Benoist contributes a political article in which he proposes certain reforms in the organisation of universal suffrage.—In a literary and critical essay, M. René Doumic discusses the works of one of the younger novelists, M. René Bazin, who in his pictures of provincial life and manners, bears some resemblance to our own kailyairders.—In a short but suggestive paper, M. Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé indicates what he calls Pasteur's philosophical legacy.—A very notable article entitled 'La Cour d'Assises de la Seine' appears in the number bearing the date of the 1st of November. It is by M. Jean Cruppi, himself a lawyer, occupying, if we mistake not, an important position in the Cour de Cassation, and is, practically, a vigorous impeachment of the jury system as it exists at present.—M. Perrot's essay 'Le Religion de la Mort et les Rites funéraires en Grèce,' is a most erudite, but most interesting as well as instructive contribution to classical archæology; it traces the development and indicates the meaning and bearing of funeral rites amongst the ancient Greeks.—M. Augustin Filon brings a further instalment—it looks like the last—of his 'Le Théâtre Anglais Contemporain.' In it he relates the attempts made to introduce Ibsen into England; and he ventures a forecast as to what the English stage of the immediate future is likely to

be.—In the second of the two November numbers, there are two well written and appreciative critical essays, one devoted to the dramatist Augier, the other to the historian Augustin Thierry.—A very striking and very original production is that bearing the signature of Arède Barine. It is styled an essay in pathological literature, and indicates the influence of wine—to which he was more than moderately addicted—on the work of Hoffmann.—December brings one article to which English readers will turn with interest. It is by M. Robert de la Sizeraine, the author of a recent remarkable work on the English pre-Raphaelite school of painting, and is devoted to a close and appreciative study of Ruskin.—Some interesting facts concerning Victor Hugo will be found in M. Adolphe Jullien's '*Le Romantisme et l'Editeurs Renduel*.'—M. Charles Benoist again discusses the re-organisation of universal suffrage, and advocates a proportional representation of opinions.—M. Ollivier begins a series of articles on '*Prince Louis Napoleon*.' The present instalment only comes down to 1848.

REVUE DES ÉTUDES JUIVES (No 3, 1895).—The first article in this number is on the chronology of Genesis, and is from the pen of M. Julius Oppert. On the subject of ancient chronology that veteran Assyriologist is an authority of the first rank. He has done much in past years to make, if not simple, which is impossible, yet clear to most educated minds, the systems of chronology of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, etc., on which all later systems that have found favour, have been largely dependent. The relation of the Hebrew system, or systems rather (for that followed in Genesis is based on the Chaldean, while that favoured by the historians of Israel's destinies from the Exodus rests rather on the history of Israel considered as a series of periods divided from each other by certain striking events); the relation of the Hebrew systems to the systems of the older races has been the subject of more than one work of M. Oppert, and here he reconsiders it in the light of his more recent studies, and gives the conclusions to which these have led him. This more especially with regard to the *data* in Genesis in their relation to these older systems. The authors of Genesis take as a starting point the same numbers and the same astronomical cycles for the period of creation, and the pre- and post-diluvian eras. M. Oppert shows the principle followed by the authors of Genesis in the modification of these numbers, and furnishes a very interesting and instructive comparison between them. He brings out, too, the indications, contained in the Genesis chronological *data*, of myths now lost to us, but the echoes of which are heard in the

mythologies of Greece, and other lands.—The second article is a short paper read by M. Theodore Reinach before the Académie des Inscriptions, and which was supplementary to a paper read at a previous meeting of the Académie by M. Oppert. It concerned a cuneiform inscription, deciphered by M. Schiel, which mentions—and it is the first document yet discovered which does—the incident referred to in Herodotus, Book ii, ch. 159. That passage in Herodotus has been the subject of much controversy. The situation of 'Magdolos' is not sufficiently defined so as to make it easy to determine it, and conjecture therefore has been busy in the absence of precise data. Megiddo has been put forward as the Magdolos of Herodotus, but there are insuperable obstacles to the acceptance of that identification. Gaza is now universally regarded as the Biblical form of the Cadytis mentioned in connexion with Magdolos by the Father of History; and that rules Megiddo entirely out of court. M. Reinach discusses the question very fully, and shows that the Syrians spoken of by Herodotus were the Assyrians; that there were several—five at least—places named Magdolos; and that there are good reasons for regarding Necho's expedition, spoken of, as that against the Assyrians, who were the over-lords of the Philistian, as well as all the Syrian, district, at the time of the expedition. If this be the correct conjecture then sufficient reason is seen for the dedication on the part of Necho of his coat of arms to the Milesian Apollo. The greatness of his victory at once explains his action.—M. Lehmann continues and completes here his study on the Jewish Sects mentioned in the Mishnas of Berakoth and Meguilla. Here he deals with the sects of the Sadducees and Pharisees, and shows how the former, to which the priestly families and the opulent classes chiefly belonged, were held under control by the Sanhedrim, and how powerful the influence of the Pharisees was over the latter body. Whatever might be the personal opinions of the Sadducee officials of the Temple, or their ideas as to the conduct of worship, they were bound to comply with the regulations made as to the worship by the Sanhedrim, and to proclaim the doctrine of a future life in the ritual they had to observe. The other principal articles are, M. Danon's on 'Les impôts directs et indirects des communautés Israélites en Turquie;' M. D. Kaufmann's 'La famille de Pise;' and M. Bloch's 'Une expulsion de Juifs en Alsace au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.' There are important notes also on grammatical, exegetical, and historical points, and the 'Bibliographie' and book reviews are extensive.

REVUE SÉMITIQUE D'EPIGRAPHIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE (No. 4, 1895).—M. J. Halévy's 'Recherches Bibliques' in this

number are confined to Genesis xxii.-xxv. He first takes chapters xxii. and xxiii. together, and then chapters xxiv. and xxv. The usual plan in both instances is followed; that is, the contents in each case are briefly summarised, and then the Massoretic text is closely scrutinised, the terms or phrases peculiar to, or favoured by, the writer are noted, and their use in other passages, where they prove illustrative, is referred to, and such incidental remarks as are clearly dependent on, or refer back to, incidents already narrated, are carefully pointed out, and their value as indicating unity of authorship insisted on. M. Halévy's object is to defend that unity of authorship as against the modern critical school, as well as to clear up many obscure passages in the Book of Genesis (or such other text as he handles in these 'Recherches.') In connexion with the latter object he frequently suggests an emendation on the Massoretic text, which often, if it be correct, takes the edge off the criticisms, adverse to the unity of authorship of the school to which he is so much opposed. These suggested emendations are at least always ingenious, scholarly, and plausible, and give a much more natural and rational meaning to the text than it offers in its present state. A happy instance or two of this may be noted here, just to whet our readers' curiosity. Exegetes have long been sadly perplexed with the word *ahar* after *ayil* in Genesis xxii. 13. It has been taken as a preposition, as by the translators of the Authorised and Revised Versions, and as an adverb of place, as by Kalisch and many others. There is nothing in the text for *ahar* to govern, but the Authorised Version and Revised Version furnish it (in italics) and translate 'behind *him*.' Kalisch translates it 'in the back ground,' and both have been felt to be extremely unsatisfactory by other exegetes. It has been suggested to read the word as *ehad*, by simply placing *daleth* into the place of *resh*, and to translate a (= one) ram. That has not met with a much better reception at the hands of critics. M. Halévy here suggests to replace the *cheth* by *beth* in the offending term and to read it therefore as *obed*. We have now therefore *ayil obed* = a strayed ram, as the reading offered us. The change is very simple. The mistake in transcription, which M. Halévy supposes to have taken place, is one which may very likely have occurred. It was one very easy to make, and has been often made by even careful copyists of Hebrew. But the proposed change makes the verse perfectly lucid. The ram must have belonged to some flock, but had wandered, and was now found by Abraham in this out of the way and unlikely region. Another emendation equally ingenious but also equally successful is that suggested in chapter xxiv. 53. One of the argu-



ments of the critical school against the unity of the text of Genesis here is drawn from the occurrence of *l'ahiah* = to her brother. Why were the presents given to Rebekah's brother? It was only to the father and mother that such presents fell to be given. M. Halévy here again suggests to replace the *cheth* in the offending word by *beth*, and to read therefore 'to her father.' M. Halévy's 'Recherches' abound with such helpful suggestions. After the analysis of the text he brings out the harmony that exists between incident and incident in the Genesis narrative, and offers very striking explanations of the difficulties against which critics have stumbled; while he is very severe on the methods of amputation and erasion to which they have recourse with so light a hand in their dealings with the text, when it opposes their theories.—M. Perruchon finishes his 'Index' to M. Halévy's transcription of the Tell-el-Amarua Letters, and M. Karppe his translation of, with notes on, the Nabopolassar Inscription, which has been running through several numbers of this *Revue*.—M. C. Huart brings also to a close his series of articles on 'Epigraphie arabe d'Asie Mineure.'—M. Halévy furnishes another article on the averments of Prof. Buhler as to the script used in the inscriptions found in the Stupa of Bhattiprolu. He titles it 'Un dernière mot sur le kharosthi.' He has several notes also on other inscriptions, Phœnician and Aramaean.

LA MONDE MODERNE (November)—Fiction is represented by M. Jean Reibach's 'La Partie d'échecs.'—M. Henri Carrée writes on M. Neckar.—'How a frontier is formed,' referring to recent advances in the south of Algiers, and an article on the building of an ironclad deal with military affairs.—M. de Dubois describes the salles de travail des imprimés in the National Library, and refers to the difficulty which must soon be experienced in finding room for the books which such a library must contain. In France at present, there are over 2000 periodicals, each with its one or two stout annual volumes.—Another interesting paper by M. Gustave Coquiôt deals with the Paris horse-market.—The papers on the centenary of the Institute, 'Un déjeuner à Chantilly,' 'Corners of France,' 'The Hospital of Beaune,' are remarkable for their excellent illustrations.—(December).—'Louise,' a sketch of showman life by Glatron.—Hotel Lheureux.—'Sensations du Maquis,' an illustrated paper on Corsica.—'Fantin-Latour,' with some excellent reproductions of his works.—A paper on 'Fire-Damp,' with sketches of underground life, by M. Dieudonné.—The proposed Museum of Decorative Art in Paris, gives M. de Nolhac an opportunity of calling attention to the rich treasures of decora-

tion already contained in Versailles.—‘Military Ballooning,’ by Lux.—‘L’Enseignement Agricole’ gives an idea of the thoroughness with which agriculture is taught in France. Over and above the National Institute, and 5 national schools in the provinces, there are 39 general practical schools, 37 écoles d’apprentissage, 90 chairs in the various departments of the country, 101 courses in agriculture given in high schools, etc., and a compulsory course in the elementary schools, not to mention numerous experimental stations, etc.—‘Corners of Venice’ with new and interesting illustrations from a recent Venetian work.—Papers on ‘Austerlitz,’ ‘La Folie,’ ‘Le Convent des Carmes,’ make up an interesting and varied number.

REVUE CELTIQUE (October, 1895).—In the first article M. S. Reinach calls attention to a set of plaster casts of a number of Gallo-Roman bas-reliefs found at Strasburg, but destroyed in 1870 during the Prussian bombardment of that city. The casts are now in the museum of Saint Germain. The one to which attention is here particularly drawn is the somewhat mutilated picture of a man standing under a sort of arcade, with the inscription ERVMO beneath it. This inscription M. Reinach argues is the name of a Gallic divinity Erumo not otherwise known.—Dr. Whitely Stokes prints for the first time the Rawlinson fragment B 502 of the Annals of Tigernach. The entries cover the period from about the eighth century B.C. down to the time of Antoninus Pius.—M. J. Dottin adds to the series of Irish Tales he has been contributing to the *Revue* a version of the Death of the Sons of Usnech somewhat different from that printed some time ago by M. D’Arbois de Jubainville. As usual the text is accompanied by translations, in this case French, and grammatical notes.—M. E. Ernault provides the volume, of which this is the concluding number, with a table of the principal words discussed in its pages.

#### SPAIN.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA (October 1895).—A touching little story of ‘The girl of the fifth floor,’ by Narciso Campillo, leads on to ‘The scientific progress of Chili,’ in which the author speaks hopefully of the advance of the Spanish races of America, and concludes with the pious belief, that as soon as education and culture take proper root in the Spanish races of America, the hour will have sounded for the formation of that Spanish-American nationality which must be the most prosperous and powerful in the world!—A very admiring life notice of the late M. Guyau, whose work on ‘Education and heredity’ has just been translated

into Spanish, follows.—Perez de Guzman gives a most interesting account of the growth of periodic literature in Spain during the century, although somewhat gushing over names that have never reached the outer world. Still the paper is valuable historically!—‘The adventures of an old soldier’ promise to be particularly interesting. They come as an interlude to the Francomania that at present rules in Spain, and recall the fact that, ‘The Great Napoleon was a miscreant and a robber in Spain,’ and that his followers treated the people with unparalleled barbarity. The old general is an Aragonese from Borja, in the fertile populous valley of Huecha, where the people brag that, although surrounded by mountains, they can support themselves from the native produce in generous fashion.—P. Dorado has an able examination of the address of Romero Roblado at the opening of the Law Courts, which shows thorough appreciation of the recent advance in sociology.—Castelar treats of the French incapacity to retain a strong government, their ingratitude to their best statesmen, their squandering their means and energy over adventures in every part of the world, in place of preparing to recover Alsace and Lorraine. He shows that in Italy the friction between the Kingdom and the temporal claims of the Pope is unwise, and that the Catholic influence was greater when it was without any temporal power whatever.—‘The Literary Chronicle’ and ‘The International Press’ complete an admirable number. (November 1895)—After a well-written tale by Becerro de Bengoa, full of local colour, the adventures of an old soldier are continued. They give a curious insight into the state of Spain during the civil wars of this century. Casually he mentions that in Booja, in the reign of Ferdinand VII. the Fencing-master received 80 dollars a year, and the Latin-master, 60. Now the professors’ salaries are 2000 dollars a year.—‘Travelling in Spain,’ by Pardo Bazan, is as suggestive as might be expected from this admirable writer. She demands a natural development of Spain in civilisation, not a base copy.—A. Posada supplies his countrymen with a fair *resumé* of the constitution and progress of Canada, with a view to possible similar autonomy for Cuba, if the jewel of the Spanish crown is not lost finally meantime.—Echegaray continues his chatty reminiscences, and leads on to the ‘Literary Chronicle,’ which deals mainly with the address of Sr. Marano Antón, on anthropology, at the opening of the Central University.—Castelar writes admiringly of Rugiero Bonghi, the distinguished Italian recently deceased. He emphasises the necessity for France defining and solidifying the Republic, whose condition causes this distinguished politician much anxiety.—The ‘International Press’ deals with the Faust

of the poets, compared with the Faust of reality.—‘Castillian and Portuguese literature’ is from German sources, and a list of new works finishes the number.—(December) This number commences with a clever little story by Narciso Campillo. Menendes y Pelayo discourses on the famous poet of the fifteenth century, George Manrique, the author of the popular ‘Coplas,’ who is best known to English readers by Longfellow’s examples, which are very highly spoken of by the author. It appears also that examples of this poem appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1824, attributed to Richard Ford. It is worthy of all the attention paid it.—The old soldier’s stories are piquant and good; and, along with the Reminiscences of Echegaray, give a capital insight into Peninsular habits and modes of thought.—‘The Commercial Relations with the Antiles,’ is a continuation of the interesting papers on Cuban affairs. The author concludes that ‘The Cuban problem, in its various phases, is the hardest, the gravest, and the most “transcendental” which has appeared in Spanish politics since the end of the civil war.’—The municipal problem in Madrid gives cause for much anxiety owing to recent scandals, and Moret tells us of its deplorable condition, and want of sanitation in the city, so that it is the most unhealthy capital in Europe, with the highest death-rate.—The international press is absorbed in ‘The Feminine question.’—Castelar is deep in Armenia and the Eastern question, and compares the letter of the Sultan to Lord Salisbury with that of the Pope Pius II. to the conquering Sultan on the capture of Constantinople. They were both appeals of a broken cause.—The Literary Chronicle is severe on Echegaray’s latest drama.—Wolf continues his Castillian and Portuguese Literature; and another list of new works concludes the year, which has been on the whole rich in papers of Spanish interest, both local and national.

#### HOLLAND.

DE GIDS (November)—Prof. A. Pierson has a brightly written paper on Ethics, in which he criticises various definitions and the bearing of the Kantian imperative. His conclusion is that a new era will dawn for ethics when it comes to be acknowledged that morality depends not so much upon a stern ‘Thou shalt,’ as upon the inclination of the heart. He would restore Eros, in a Platonic sense, in the centre of all psychology, and it would be found that men do right from the love of it, only, in this rationalistic age, mysticism such as this is scouted.—The tragedy of Hamlet is an interesting review by Prof. Symons of Loening’s work. He considers the Jena law professor has given such a satisfactory analysis of Hamlet’s

character as may be called exhaustive, not that other German essays on the subject will not follow.—Pasteur's life and work is appreciatively noticed by Pekelharing.—(December)—This number contains the close of Jaeger's story, 'Toga and Sword,' a story of the East Indies and the Atjeh War, with many stirring and pathetic scenes.—An article on 'The nature of Literature,' by Henri Borel, is based on the last work of the new and much lauded Dutch poet, Frederik van Eeden, whose 'Song of Semblance and Reality' is worthy, he thinks, of special study. It reflects many of the ideas of the old Indian philosophy, yet is a revelation of what the essence of sound literature of all times must be, an everlasting, deep-sounding swell of adoration pulsing on towards the Supreme Light.—Of a more prosaic cast is a paper by Valk on the regulation of the salt trade and industry in Dutch India.—'Comic Dutch History,' by Doedes, contains many entertaining things. He begins with Van Lennep's 'Pictures,' and passes on to other more recent rather elaborate efforts, but perhaps the best are undesignedly comic pieces, originating in the United States, such as 'Legends of the Netherlands,' by Gideon J. Tucker, 'dedicated to the millions of native born Americans who are descended from Holland Dutch ancestry.' Or again, from the year-book of the Holland Society of New York, 1895, this quotation: 'So Holland is venerable, impressive, sublime. Many nations might have absorbed her, but sacred memories forbade. The French Republic annexed her but Napoleon was constrained to give her a kingdom': which, of course, is nearly the contrary of what really happened.—A long and pleasant article on 'Playing Cards,' by Singels, follows.—(January)—This number begins with a slight story, 'Awakened,' in which a young wife awakes to the conviction that her husband is a brute—so much of a brute that she ought to have found it out long before.—Science and liberal Protestantism, by Groenewegen, is partly a review of Brunetière's 'La Science et la Religion.' That book, understanding by religion a dogmatic system like the Roman, advocates the complete separation of science and religion. On the other hand, the free Protestantism of the nineteenth century owes its very existence, in part, to science, which it can never regard as an enemy. Modern science, to give one example out of many, has given us practically a new Bible, stripped of the superstitious and miraculous. But still liberal Protestantism is not to be regarded as characteristically scientific, and with only religious sympathies. On the contrary, its very existence and basis is our close relation to God, the Life of our life. The influence of science only contributed to bring this out more fully and clearly.—'The Frisian Language and its Study,' by



Dr. Hettema, contains much that is interesting, and the two chapters of this article are a portion of a work which is to be published this year. In Friesland itself there is the utmost enthusiasm for the tongue, shown by the existence of the Frysk Selskip, and a Frisian Museum, especially rich in numismatic treasures.—A legal article by Molengraaff on the 'Research of Paternity,' which is interdicted by Dutch law, advocates the repeal of the present statutes on moral grounds, and shows how much evil and injustice results from the law as it stands.—A pretty but sad short story, 'Prentice,' by A. W. Pulle, depicts the miserable life of a boy on board a Dutch warship and his flight from it.

THEOLOGISCH TIJDSCHRIFT (November).—Dr. Kusters enters on his reply to the critics of his *Restoration of Israel in the Persian Period*; the work in which he declares the return under Cyrus to be unhistorical. He is able to cite Professor T. K. Cheyne, in his 'Introduction to the book of Isaiah,' as in the main agreeing with his conclusions; the present paper is directed against Prof. J. Wellhausen, who has attacked and contradicted them. The Dutchman seems to make out his case against the German, who concedes to him the unhistorical character of the narrative in Ezra, and supports the return under Cyrus only by inferences from other books.—Dr. H. P. Berlage gives a new rendering of Rom. vi. 10, 'In that he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth he liveth unto God.' The death and the life spoken of, he thinks, are not metaphorical, but the physical death and the post-resurrection life, of Christ. The passage means: Inasmuch as he died, he died once, as he was under the dominion of sin (since sin has established its rule over all men and brought death upon all men), so as to satisfy what the rule of sin required (not—he died away from sin, in some metaphorical sense), and inasmuch as he lives, he lives for God as belonging to God, (really, not only morally). The notion that Christ was under the rule of sin, and had to die in order to satisfy the claim sin puts forward on all the children of Adam, is to be met elsewhere in Paul.—A set of interesting reviews fill up the number.—In the January number Dr. P. A. Klap continues his studies on Agobard of Lyons; but there is not much matter of general interest.

#### GREECE.

JOURNAL OF THE HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF GREECE (Vol. IV., Part 16. November, 1895).—N. G. Politès in an article on 'Popular Cosmogonic Myths,' attempts to trace

the native Hellenic beliefs on the subject, as distinguished from Asiatic and other traditions which show their influence even in Homer and Hesiod. He finds it in a myth which is common in Greece to the effect that God, or heaven, was formerly so close to earth that living creatures could touch him. An ox licked him, or according to other versions a bad man threw ashes in his face, or a serpent lit a great fire to burn him, whereupon he promised the sea depth, if it would give him height. The two kicked each other apart. The heaven rose to the height which it now is, and the depth of the sea is equal to the heaven's height. Strangely enough, the closest parallel to this myth is found among the Polynesians. Mr. Politês traces this myth in Euripides (fr. 488, *Nauck*); and regards it as the key to Hesiod's account of the mutilation of Ouranos, which has excited the suspicion of many critics; and also as the true germ of the myth of Atlas, whom Homer describes as keeping the pillars which hold earth and heaven apart. According to Hellenic belief the sea is confined by three hairs. Cypriote tradition adds that two are broken, and when the third breaks, the world will be overwhelmed. References to the end of the world are as a rule rare in Greek folk-lore. The paper closes with some interesting myths regarding the creation of men and beasts.—K. Nestorides publishes a letter from a MS. in the Synodical Library at Moscow, written between 1415 and 1430, by John Eugenikos, brother of Mark of Ephesus who figured in the Council of Florence. It describes in glowing terms the Lacedæmonian village of Petrîna.—Spir. P. Lambros publishes some MSS. from the Archivio del Frari at Venice. Some are marriage contracts of the fifteenth century. Others are documents of various Turkish authorities in Peloponnesus, A.D. 1526 and 1527. The writer inserts a discussion on the word Morea from these and other documents, (in particular a hitherto unpublished Greek version of the life of S. Nikôn called Repent!) he is led to the opinion that the neuter form Moreou, Moraion, or Môron is the most ancient, that it first became known through S. Nikôn's connection with a place called Môron, or the mulberry-grove, in the reign of Nikêphorus Phôkas, and that its general use dating from A.D. 1111, corresponds to the introduction of sericulture into the Peloponnesos.—'History and Documents of the Monastery Xenia,' by N. I. Giaunopoulos.—Memoranda from a MS. relating to events in Berroea and district at the end of the seventeenth century.—Popular tales from Kastellorhizia, and three popular songs, contributed by Ach. S. Diamantara.—The Nightingale-feast in Stenomacho, celebrated on the eve and day of S. John:

## DENMARK.

YEAR-BOOK FOR NORTHERN ARCHÆOLOGY AND HISTORY (Vol. 10. Part 2. 1895).—Prof. Bugge begins a series of contributions to Northern Mythology by an article on *finngálkn*, one of the mythical monsters of the sagas, which he tries to connect with Finnish wizards on the one hand, and the Egyptian sphinx on the other. His theories are, as usual, very ingenious, if not very convincing.—‘Memorials of the family of Snubbe in Sengelöse Parish,’ by Arkiv-sekretair Thiset, contains an account of a remarkable monument, ‘Snubbe Cross,’ which formerly stood on the old highway from Copenhagen to Roskilde, and was for centuries kept in repair, until it was allowed to fall to pieces about 1815. The article closes with various historical and genealogical notes on the family of Snubbe, and an illustration of a tombstone dating from 1311.—‘The Age of the Granite Churches of Jutland,’ by V. Koch, is a contribution to a dispute in which Danish architects differ widely, but is of little interest to the unprofessional reader.—(Part 3).—A Swedish article by Dr. Carl Wibling on ‘The Foundations of Lund Cathedral,’ deals with the nature of the soil underlying this interesting edifice, and especially with an old ‘culture-layer’ of considerable thickness, containing many small objects and bones of animals. The finds are described with great exactness, and are considered to bear out the idea that the cathedral has been erected on the site of an older place of sacrifice.—‘A few peculiarities in the choirs of some Jutlandish Churches’ is another architectural dissertation of no general interest.—V. Koch’s ‘Norman and Irish forms of building in Danish Churches’ has more interest for outsiders, as the author endeavours to illustrate the original construction of Aarhus Cathedral from that of St. Albans Abbey, and of a village church in Bornholm from St. Flannan’s oratory and Cormac’s chapel in Ireland. The theory is not improbable, considering the former close connection between Denmark and Great Britain.—‘Jelling and the History of its Monuments,’ by O. Nielsen, is chiefly interesting for the historical information concerning the two famous runic stones erected for King Gorm and Queen Thyra, which first came into general notice in 1586.

## ICELAND.

TÍMARIT HINS ÍSLENZKA BÓKMENNTAFJELAGS (1895).—This issue is a volume of over 200 pages, and does great credit to Icelandic scholarship. The opening articles deal with the vexed question of the home of the Edda. Dr. Finn Jónsson defends his assignation of them to Norway against the attack

made in last year's *Tímarit* by Dr. Björn M. Olsen. To this again Dr. Björn Olsen replies with good effect. Where such authorities differ, it is difficult to decide, but Dr. Olsen seems to have the best of it in supporting the claims of Iceland.—Olaf Davidsson gives a most interesting account of a tragic occurrence in the West of Iceland in 1615, when a number of Spaniards were rather unjustifiably put to death. He also prints for the first time a poem of the period, giving the Icelandic view of the occurrence.—‘Eirík Bloodaxe,’ by Dean Jón Jónsson, is a piece of research into tenth century chronology, and has in it a good deal bearing on British history.—‘Forty years ago,’ by Thorkel Bjárnason, is a defence of the same author’s previous account of Icelandic life, and has many interesting details.—‘New Icelandic prosody,’ by Jóhannes Jóhannsson is a dissertation on the laws of metre observed in modern Icelandic verse. The whole part is of great interest and merit.

#### AMERICA.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW (No. 1).—This is the first number of a new publication which is to do for American historical literature what the *English Historical Review* is doing for English. It is based on exactly the same lines, and follows the same plan. Here it makes a very creditable appearance, and seems to contain promise of considerable life. The principal articles are all of course on American topics.—Mr. W. M. Sloane takes for his subject ‘History and Democracy,’ while Mr. Moses Coit Tyler writes upon ‘The Loyalist Party during the American Revolution,’ and Mr. H. C. Lea upon ‘The First Castilian Inquisitor,’—Niccolo Franco, who, as a bull here published for the first time shows, was appointed by Sixtus IV., August 1, 1475.—Two other articles complete the list. The first is by Mr. H. Adams on ‘Count Edward de Crillon,’ and the second by Mr. F. J. Turner on ‘Western State-making in the Revolutionary Era.’—Under ‘Documents’ we have a series of hitherto unedited letters by Col. W. Byrd, 1736-1739, and ‘Intercepted Letters’ of Col. G. R. Clark, 1778-1779, together with certain letters addressed to Jefferson Davis or his War Secretary, concerning the State of Georgia in 1865.—Amongst the ‘Reviews of Books’ are notices of several historical works by English writers. A notice which, however, unlike the rest, is unsigned, speaks somewhat disparagingly of Mr. Hodgkin’s Lombard volumes. By some singular mischance a notice of a volume of theology has strayed into the ‘reviews.’ The fact, however, that the author of the volume is Professor Briggs may explain how it comes to be reviewed here.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

---

*Philosophy of Theism*, being the Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1894-95. First Series. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, LL.D., etc. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1895.

There can be little question that Prof. Fraser is the first Gifford Lecturer who has fully appreciated the terms of the trust deed of the Foundation to which he owes his appointment. Previous lecturers have laid themselves open to misconception, and have to some extent been led away from the true subject-matter of the enquiry, by a very free adoption of the historical method which, thanks to the Hegelian school, has lately gained an undesirable predominance in these departments. To be more definite, they have, as a rule, obliterated the distinction between natural and revealed religion at the outset, and, on this tacit departure from the Deed of Gift, have occupied much time and wholly disproportionate space in the discussion of matters beyond their legitimate sphere. Prof. Fraser commits no such error, and, even if his book—seeing that it contains the introductory course only—does not arrive at strikingly new conclusions regarding the ultimate problem, it is a refreshing, synthetic, and yet withal sober, presentation of the entire subject. Hitherto, students of philosophy have been all too ready to allow Prof. Fraser's achievements as an editor to overshadow his original contributions to philosophy. This work will tend to redress the balance. For it is a mine of information, and the contents as a whole revolve round the single question of the ultimate meaning of the universe. Further, if in the second course the enticing suggestions here made regarding the spiritual nature of the world be more elaborated, the contribution to our knowledge, so conveniently presented in the present volume, may be supplemented by a stimulus to original investigation in this line such as the author has already given to many, in connection with the development of British speculative thought, in his standard monographs on Locke and Berkeley. All Scottish students will unite in warm wishes that he may have health and strength for this constructive work, and will so re-echo Prof. Fraser's own desire most touchingly expressed in his introductory lecture.

*An Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England.* By the Rev. C. F. MACLEAN, D.D., etc., and the Rev. W. W. WILLIAMS, M.A., etc. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

This volume may probably be taken as a further indication of the revival of the study of Theology in England. While adhering to the 'old paths,' it is evidently animated by a spirit which is not in the least afraid of the 'new light,' as it is called, or of modern thought, but is itself wise and reverent and not averse to the free use of the more reliable developments of modern thought and knowledge for the elucidation of the convictions it contains and in confirmation of the truths it illustrates. As a manual for the use of students, it makes no pretensions whatever to



take the place of such works as those of Bishops Browne or Forbes. As its authors say, it is an Introduction, and is designed by them to prepare the student for the more complete discussions to be found in larger works on the Articles of the English Church. In this quality, apart altogether from the doctrines contained in the Articles, and viewed only as an expository and literary work, we can only speak of it with the highest respect. With the help of one or two quotations the essential character of the Articles as an irenicon is distinctly brought out in the Preface; the Introduction narrates their history with admirable succinctness, and the rest of the volume is taken up with the exposition. The Articles are broken up into convenient sections and the Latin text of 1563 is given side by side with the English of 1571. The arguments in support of the doctrines are given concisely and with singular clearness. For the notes and references the authors have drawn largely upon the works of their predecessors, the attention of the student being continually directed to them for fuller discussions. The ancient authors referred to, it may further be remarked, are not only English and Protestant, they are also Catholic. At the same time many references are to be found in the notes which are not to be met with in the other expositions. These are for the most part to works of quite recent origin, the brief citations from which are always to the point. The two maps at the end of the volume are extremely useful.

*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen.* By W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895.

In two former works, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, and *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Professor Ramsay has already thrown considerable light on the beginnings of Christianity in Asia Minor. In the volume before us, which contains the substance of his Morgan Lectures, delivered at the Theological Seminary of Auburn, in the State of New York, and his Mansfield College Lectures, 1895, he follows up the work which he began in the first of the volumes mentioned, by a minute examination of the text of the Acts of the Apostles with a view chiefly to ascertaining the date of its authorship and the trustworthiness of its narrative. Stated in his own words, the hypothesis with which he sets out is, 'that Acts was written by a great historian, a writer who set himself to record the facts as they occurred, a strong partisan indeed, but raised above partiality by his perfect confidence that he had only to describe facts as they occurred, in order to make the truth of Christianity and the honour of Paul apparent.' 'It is not my object,' he further says, 'to assume or to prove that there was no prejudice in the mind of Luke, no fault on the part of Paul; but only to examine whether the facts stated are trustworthy, and leave them to speak for themselves (as the author does). I shall argue that the work was composed by a personal friend and disciple of Paul, and if this be once established, there will be no hesitation in accepting the primitive tradition that Luke was the author.' Mr. Ramsay has already shown himself by his classical as well as by his other studies, to be admirably qualified to conduct the argument here proposed, and the result is a volume which, while advocating views very different from many which have recently been advanced, is of such importance that no student of the Acts of the Apostles or of the life of St. Paul can afford to overlook it. To a large extent it is controversial, as holding the views the author does it was almost bound to be. Among the views Mr. Ramsay seeks to controvert are a number put forth by the late Bishop Lightfoot,

as well as many held by writers of the Tübingen School, though originally he was himself prejudiced in favour of that school. Mr. Ramsay may have some difficulty in getting his opinion as to the date of the composition of the Acts of the Apostles accepted, but his views respecting the trustworthiness of St. Luke and his ability as an historical writer will meet with very general assent. From those who would place him as a second or third rate writer he altogether departs, and claims that, as an historian, he stands in the foremost rank. The 'Travel-document' of which we heard in *The Church in the Roman Empire* is now defined as 'Luke's own written notes supplemented by memory, and the education of further experience and reading and research.' But we must refer the reader to the volume itself. There he will find much that is new and instructive, and many things brought to light which have hitherto been overlooked or not fully appreciated.

*The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England in the Growth of the Anglican Communion.* The Hulsean Lectures for 1894-95.  
By ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L. London and New York:  
Macmillan & Co. 1895.

The subject which Dr. Barry has here chosen for his Hulsean Lectures is of vital importance to the English Church and the spread of the Christian Faith. It is one that lies entirely to his hand, and on which few are competent to speak with equal authority. While lamenting the want of unity in the missionary efforts which are made by the various denominations in England, Dr. Barry pays a high tribute to the work which has been accomplished abroad by the dissenting communions. It is with the missions and missionary enterprise of the Church of England that he mainly deals. After an introductory lecture in which he describes the threefold mission of England in respect to the spread of the Christian Faith, he gives an account of the growth of the Church of England in the Colonies, next in India and in the East, and then among the barbarian races. All through the lectures his aim is to bring home to his readers the greatness of the responsibility resting upon Englishmen, more particularly upon those belonging to the English Church, of spreading their faith and of uniting in the work with greater zeal and liberality. Three long but instructive Appendices are added to the lectures in which the history of the English Church missions in their threefold sphere is carefully traced. To numbers of the English communion and to all others who are interested in the extension of the Christian Faith, both the lectures and the appendices, which occupy almost as much space as the lectures they illustrate, can scarcely fail to be as instructive as interesting.

*Some Thoughts on Christian Reunion.* By W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Ripon. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

This volume contains seven visitation addresses delivered by Dr. Carpenter during last June. The subject with which they deal is one which has been causing considerable discussion in a certain circle and has called forth many opinions. Perhaps that was the main result which those who originated the discussions expected. As to any practical issue Dr. Carpenter is not sanguine. He sees difficulties on all sides, and entertains little, if any, hope of a general reunion among Christians. The irreconcilables, he thinks, are to be found in the Roman and in the Eastern Church. Among the Protestant Churches he is disposed to think there is a stronger desire

for a reunion of Christendom. At the same time there appear to him to be few, if any insurmountable difficulties among them. This may or may not be the case. Some among the Protestant Churches may be disposed to set aside their differences; but the probability is that others, perhaps the majority among them, are as extreme in their opinions and as tenacious of them as those whom he blames in the Latin and Greek Churches. But be that as it may, there is much to be learned from Dr. Carpenter's addresses. They are informed by a large and tolerant charity and may do much to spread clearer views as to the actual position of the Churches and the attitude they are likely to take up in respect to the question. When a reunion does take place Dr. Carpenter believes that it will not be on the basis of uniformity, and still less on the basis of submission. It will be a union, he says, in variety, in much difference of practice, ritual, and teaching, with much mutual toleration and concession. In the second and third addresses much that is of interest is said about authority and its place in religion, while in the address which follows the influence of race on religion is treated in a fresh and attractive manner. Taken as a whole, the volume is not so much an argument for reunion as a pretty conclusive attempt to show that however desirable a reunion amongst Christians is, in present circumstances it is impossible, and will remain impossible so long as extremists succeed in retaining their rule among the Churches.

*History of Religion.* A Sketch of Primitive Beliefs and Practices, and of the Origin and Character of the Great Systems. By ALLAN MENZIES, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews. London: John Murray. 1895.

The title, *History of Religion*, is one of large promise, and even the subtitle here is of a kind to arouse large expectations. Religion, as Professor Menzies himself reminds us, is 'the inner side of civilisation, and expresses the essential spirit of human life in various ages and nations,' so that the study of the religions of the world is 'the study of the very soul of its history.' But to judge the work before us rightly, we must take into consideration the special purpose the author had in view in writing it, and the limits within which he had to confine himself in accordance with that purpose. This book was planned to form one of the series of 'Manuals' issued in connection with the University Extension movement, recently inaugurated, and had therefore to conform, as much as possible, in its size to the rest of the series, and serve a similar end—that is, be a guide in and a stimulus to further investigations into the subject with which it deals, and not an exhaustive treatise on it. As such, Professor Menzies' work deserves, we think, to take a high place in the series, and to be read and studied by a very much larger constituency than that primarily contemplated by those who planned the series. The publisher has done well in issuing two editions of the work, which, though identical in type, yet appeal each to its special class of readers. The author's standpoint is the purely historical one. His aim is 'to describe the leading features of the great religions, and to set forth some of the results which appear to have been reached regarding the relation in which these systems stand to each other.' Religion is a universal and permanent element in human life. It has rudimentary beginnings in every human soul, and has had rudimentary beginnings in the race. These rudimentary beginnings in the race have left their traces in the religious history of the most civilised nations, and are seen in the tribes or nations which have not yet advanced out of

their primitive or savage condition. Professor Menzies first takes his readers to the lowlier stages of the religious life, and describes the beliefs and practices that prevail in them. Unable within the limits prescribed to him to trace the growth and development of this religious principle everywhere (if such were possible to anyone), he proceeds to trace it in those races where it has been most distinctly marked, and which 'serve in a conspicuous manner to illustrate the principles according to which it has taken place.' Thus he describes (of course, in outline only) the leading features of the religions of the Babylonians and Assyrians, of the Chinese and the ancient Egyptians, of the Semitic, and then of the Aryan groups. Originality is not here aimed at, though in marshalling the salient points no little skill and literary judgment are displayed. The last part of his book is given to an exposition of the Christian Religion, in which our author naturally sees the culmination of the process, the outlines of which he has been tracing. Christianity is treated, of course, here as an evolution—a further stage in the development—of religion in the life of humanity. Professor Menzies does not deny, it should be emphatically stated, Divine action in this evolution. It is everywhere assumed. 'No religion,' he says, at the beginning of his book (p. 5), 'will be to us as a mere superstition, nor shall we regard any as *unguided by God*.' The Divine Inspiration is regarded by him rather as the *vera causa* of the whole process, and the furthest stage it has reached is the Christian. Here too, however, it is the historically attested facts he seeks to bring out. The Christianity here expounded is that which Christ taught, and he is careful to distinguish it from the ecclesiastical forms in which its later adherents have clothed it. These are accessories—later accretions—and not always harmonious with its free and joyous spirit. But the whole treatment of his subject is characterised by a reverent, if also scientific tone, and his book gives an admirable synopsis of the distinguishing characteristics of the great religions of the world, and therefore of the course of the development of the religious element in the life of men.

*Hedonistic Theories from Aristippus to Spencer.* By JOHN WATSON, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Queen's College, Kingston, Canada. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. 1895.

This book is really a continuation, not of the matter but of the method, of Prof. Watson's *Outline of Philosophy*. There he attempted, according to a new plan, what was practically an introduction to the study of philosophy. Instead of discussing systematically, as writers on this subject usually do, some of the more prominent philosophical problems, he refracted his own views through the medium of the systems of Comte, Mill, and Spencer. This has ever been a favourite device with the English Neo-Hegelians, and they so persist in it that one is forced to infer its special suitability to their peculiar tenets. In this new work Prof. Watson supplies an introduction to Moral Philosophy according to the same fashion. His own doctrines are not directly presented, but appear in the course of his criticism of the Hedonists, those ethical bugbears *par excellence* of the Hegelians. The work is divided into eleven chapters of which only three are allotted to ancient Hedonism, a disproportionate amount when the extent and importance of the subject are remembered. At the same time, Prof. Watson atones somewhat for this brevity by his force and clearness, even although it must be said that the favourite method of selection is pursued to the extent of unfairness. In the modern

portion the study of Hobbes is sketchy, and students would do well to supplement it by reference to Dr. James Bonar. Locke is served according to the traditional method with which Green has familiarised everyone; and the same may be said of Hume and Bentham. The best part of a somewhat sketchy and biased book is the study of Mr. Spencer.

*The Makers of Modern Rome.* By MRS. OLIPHANT. With Illustrations by HENRY P. RIVIERE, A.R.W.S., and JOSEPH PENNEL. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

In a series of charming volumes Mrs. Oliphant has already told the stories of Edinburgh, Florence, Venice, and Jerusalem. Her treatment of them has somewhat varied, but her narratives are all replete with life, and are told with that exquisite literary skill of which she is so complete a master. New and original research she has not attempted. Her aim has been to take the story of each of these great cities as it is generally known, and to show the fulness of their human life and interests. Her present volume will compare well with any of its companions. In fact we have no hesitation in saying that in picturesqueness, in literary attractions, in largeness of interests, and in the way in which it appeals to one's sympathies, it is pre-eminent among them. The beginning of modern Rome dates from the fourth century, when the seat of Empire was transferred from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Bosphorus; 'when the world had a new centre, and the sons of the men who had conducted all the great enterprises of Rome were left behind with the burden of their great names and the weight of their great wealth, and nothing to do but to enjoy and amuse themselves; no vocations to fulfil, no important public functions to occupy their time and their powers.' Starting from this point Mrs. Oliphant has given us a series of pictures of Roman society and of the makers of modern Rome, which, for fulness and literary power have rarely been equalled. First, after a sketch of the condition to which the society of Rome was reduced by the transfer of the government to Constantinople, we are introduced to the little company which gathered together in the palace on the Aventine, to those 'honourable women not a few,' who gathered around Albina, Asella and Marcella, her daughters, Paula, Fabiola, and Melania, whom Athanasius visited, and among whom Jerome was an admired guest while acting as secretary to the Council held at Rome in 382 and afterwards to Damasus. The scene sometimes changes to Egypt and Bethlehem, but the narrative always returns to the 'mother house' on the Aventine, and shows the influence which the new life which was there nourished was having upon Christian as well as upon pagan Rome. After tracing the history of this society down to the sack of the eternal city by Alaric and the death of Marcella, Mrs. Oliphant passes over a period of about one hundred and fifty years, and proceeds to sketch the lives of the great 'Popes who made the Papacy,' Gregory the Great, Gregory VII., and Innocent III. Next we have the story of the Rienzi episode; and then the histories of the 'Popes who made the City' down to Julius II. and Leo X. The volume has, as we have already said, many attractions, and holds the reader's attention from beginning to end. A touching prefatory note disarms adverse criticism, and renders the reviewer indisposed to look for minor faults. Indeed, such is the quality of the volume that any such, if they exist, will be readily overlooked.

*The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain.* By MONTAGUE BURROWS, Chichele Professor of Modern History



in the University of Oxford, etc., etc. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1895.

In disentangling the history of the foreign policy of Great Britain from the general story of the nation, and setting it out in a clear and consecutive narration, Professor Burrows has done a very useful piece of work, and greatly facilitated its study. His volume supplies a decided want in the historical literature of the country, and will doubtless meet with acceptance among that large class of readers who are in the habit of imagining that the foreign policy of the country has hitherto been governed by accident more than by principle, or have been unable to see anything like continuity or continuous development in it. The aim of Professor Burrows is to show that ever since the Norman Conquest, but more especially since the accession of Henry VII. except during the Stuart period, the foreign policy of the country, notwithstanding the shifting character of its alliances, has been governed by a fixed principle, having for its ultimate object the protection of the country against foreign invasion and the preservation and development of its trade and commerce. His story sets many old facts in new lights, and makes a department of our national history, which to many is obscure, luminous. A work like this, however, if it is to be of use to the student, ought to be supplied with references.

*The Relief of Chitral.* By Captain G. J. YOUNGHUSBAND and Captain FRANK E. YOUNGHUSBAND, C.I.E. Maps and Illustrations. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

Though not the first in the field, this volume is likely to take the first place as an authoritative narrative of what is now reckoned on all hands one of the most brilliant feats of modern arms, the relief of Chitral. It is the work of two brothers who, it seems, are constantly being mistaken for one another, Captain G. J. Younghusband and Captain Frank E. Younghusband. Both are officers in the Indian army, and both of them had ample opportunities of informing themselves minutely respecting the subject on which they write. Captain George Younghusband acted throughout the whole of the campaign on General Low's staff, while his brother, Captain Frank Younghusband, had already, before the relief was undertaken, resided a couple of years in Chitral in political charge of the place, and was thoroughly acquainted both with the country around Chitral and the district through which Colonel Kelly made his now celebrated march. The former therefore narrates the operations which were personally conducted by General Low, while the narrative of the defence of Chitral and of the heroic efforts of the troops under Colonel Kelly are from the hand of the latter. The literary merits of the volume are of the highest order. Few military narratives will compare with it for clearness, precision and conciseness. The interest of the reader is sustained throughout, while every here and there he is thrilled by some incident of more than ordinary peril or devotion. Limitations of space do not here allow of quotations, otherwise we could fill page after page with extracts showing the high character of the troops employed, of what splendid work they were capable, how admirably they were led, and with what patient enthusiasm and devotion to duty they overcame obstacles which to many seemed impossible. Suffice it to say that the defence and relief of Chitral is one of the brightest chapters in the history of the British army, and that the authors of the volume before us have, by the manner in which they have written it, established a name for themselves in military history which will not easily be surpassed.

*A History of the University of Aberdeen, 1475-1895.* By JOHN MALCOLM BULLOCH, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1895.

The inspiring *motif* of this History was the (then) prospective celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the University of Aberdeen. If the idea of providing such a work for such an occasion was a happy one on the part of Mr. P. J. Anderson, the Librarian, his selection of Mr. Bulloch as the one most likely to do justice to the task, has proved not less so. It could hardly have fallen, we think, judging from the book before us, into more competent hands. It has evidently been with Mr. Bulloch a labour of love. It bears no marks whatever of having been 'made to order.' The 'history' is detailed with praiseworthy fullness, yet within short compass, and is written in a light and humorous vein. There is not a dry or uninteresting page in it. It will be read with delight and profit not only by those who have had academic relations with the northern university, or hail from the granite city, but by all who are, however slightly, interested in our national history, or in that of our higher education. The history of our universities is, of course, an integral and most important part of our national history. They furnish to a large extent the makers of that history, and the influence these men are to exercise on the destinies of their country is determined very considerably by the training they receive, and the environment surrounding them in their undergraduate days. This is brought out very well in the course of Mr. Bulloch's narrative. The seemingly uncongenial soil in which the University was planted, its early difficulties, its checkered fortunes, the antagonisms it provoked, the varying policies it pursued, the changes of administration it has undergone, its periods of corruption and weakness, of reform and vigour, are all described in their order, and numerous charming cameos are interspersed—cameos of its directing spirits, its fostering friends, its bitter enemies, its illustrious teachers, and conspicuous drones, so that we are never allowed to grow weary or lose interest for a moment as we follow the story. It is full of valuable information to one and all, and will be read, and re-read, with delight for the information it gives, and the bright and lively style in which it is written.

*Pagan Ireland: An Archæological Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Antiquities.* By W. G. WOOD-MARTIN, M.R.I.A. Illustrated. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1895.

Pagan Ireland is a large subject and covers an immense field. A writer who attempts to give anything like an adequate sketch of its remains requires a brave heart, a large memory, and a calm and judicious temper. The pitfalls that beset him on every hand in the shape of theories and fancies are numerous, and it is only by the continuous exercise of a clear and independent judgment that he is able to avoid falling into them. Mr. Wood-Martin has evidently the requisite qualifications. His somewhat bulky volume of over seven hundred closely printed pages, though modestly put forth as a 'sketch' and a 'handbook,' is in reality an elaborate and reliable treatise on almost all that is known about Ireland previous to the introduction of Christianity into the island, with a good deal of information respecting ways and customs which have survived from that period. Of theories and speculations he is extremely suspicious, and has a very wholesome reliance on the teaching and efficacy of the spade.

Hence his account of Pagan Ireland, though scarcely so picturesque as some would have made it, is, if sober, and here and there a little fragmentary, reliable. From beginning to end it is based solely on the most careful research, and in place of the myths and legends of the older antiquaries which have done so much to obscure his subject, we have nothing but ascertained facts. Here and there Mr. Wood-Martin seems to be a little too suspicious; as for instance, in his notes about St. Patrick. Dr. Todd, Father Hogan, and Dr. Whitley Stokes have done sufficient we should say to make both his personality and his times distinct. On the other hand, the labours of Celtic scholars on the continent have not been wholly speculative in their results. Much might be gathered, for instance, respecting the religion of Pagan Ireland, from the volumes of the *Revue Celtique* and the works of M. d'Arbois de Jubainville and other continental scholars. These sources of information, however, Mr. Wood-Martin seems to have passed by, preferring apparently to stick to the works of native writers and the more obvious discoveries of the spade. A good deal may be said in favour of this; still philology is not without its use in archaeology, and here and there may render it great service. Like Sir Arthur Mitchell, Mr. Wood-Martin finds the past in the present, and some of the most attractive passages in his volume are those in which he brings some custom or superstition of the present into connection with the past and uses it to throw light upon what was believed and done centuries ago. Many of the illustrations in the volume are old friends, but some of them are new; but whether new or old we are glad to see them. They light up the text, and are necessary to its full appreciation. It is to be hoped Mr. Wood-Martin will continue his work and do for ancient Christian Ireland what he has here done for the country during Pagan times.

*The Utopia of Sir Thomas More in Latin from the Edition of March 1518, and in English from the First Edition of Robynson's Translation in 1551, etc.* By J. H. LUPTON, B.D. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1895.

This edition of Sir Thomas More's famous work belongs apparently to the same series as Dr. Plummer's edition of Fortescue's *Governance of England* and Mr. Burd's edition of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*. At anyrate it is issued from the same press and is got up in precisely the same style, and whether it forms one of the series or not, it deserves both on account of its subject and on account of the manner in which it has been edited to go along with the two excellent volumes with which we have coupled it. For the task of editing it Mr. Lupton has shown himself eminently qualified. He has endeavoured, as he tells us in his preface, to treat it 'with something of the exact care which is looked for, as a matter of course, in editing a classical author,' and has evidently spared no pains to make his volume as complete and perfect as possible. In addition to the text of Sir Thomas More's second edition we have the English text of the first edition of Robynson's translation—a text which is here reprinted for the first time. The Latin text has also been collated with that of later editions and the variations occurring in them as well as the changes introduced by the author have been noted. The letter and verses of Joannes Paludanus, which appeared in More's first edition, have been left out, for the reason that More omitted them in his later edition. All, however, that received More's sanction in his second issue is here reprinted. In an introduction of judicious length Mr. Lupton gives a brief sketch of Sir Thomas More's life and a still briefer one of his translator Robynson's, together with much interesting information respecting the origin of the work and its

various editions, and as well respecting other ideal Commonwealths, more especially concerning those of S. Augustine, Joseph Hall, Campanella and Lord Bacon. The footnotes explanatory of the text if not completely exhaustive, throw light upon it and are suggestive as well as informing. The work is also supplied with fac-similes of title-pages, etc., with an index and a glossary to Robynson's translation.

*Thomas Morus Utopia.* Herausgegeben von VICTOR MICHELIS und THEOBALD ZIEGLER. Mit zwei phototypischen Nachbildungen. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1895.

Unlike Mr. Lupton the editors of this volume have based their text upon that of the *editio princeps*. At the same time they have endeavoured to improve it, and to arrive at as good a text as possible through a careful collation of the various editions. In many places it differs from that given by Mr. Lupton, both as to reading and punctuation. That the volume does not contain the same amount of matter as Mr. Lupton's need hardly be said. The aim of the editors has been simply to provide the reader with a revised text, and such assistance as might be expected in a volume belonging to Dr. Herrman's series of Latin texts belonging to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The volume is a good sample of German editing. The text is prefaced by a careful life of More, and a somewhat extensive bibliographical account of the *Utopia*. The circumstances which led More to write the book as well as the characteristics of his ideal commonwealth are carefully discussed. Altogether the Introduction is a very satisfactory piece of work, and possessors of Mr. Lupton's edition may do worse than read this German edition along with it, though no more than in the Oxford work, notwithstanding that Drs. Michels and Ziegler profess to follow the first edition, will they find the verses or letter of Paludanus. All we have besides the 'einleitung' and the two phototypes is the indispensable letter to Peter Giles and then the text.

*Miscellaneous Studies: A Series of Essays by Walter Pater.*  
Prepared for the Press by CHARLES L. SHADWELL. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

The publication of these Essays emphasises afresh the great loss English literature has sustained through the death of their author, and Mr. Shadwell has done public service by gathering them together and reprinting them. They are ten in number. All of them bear the well-known characteristics of Mr. Pater's writings—freshness and depth of thought, and clear expression. Written at various times, and in different moods, as might be expected, they are of somewhat unequal value. The final essay, 'Diaphaneité,' seems to have occasioned their editor some amount of hesitancy, yet no one will find fault with him, we should say, for reprinting it here. It is the only known specimen of Mr. Pater's early writing, and on that account alone, though not without sufficient merit, deserved to find a place somewhere among his published writings. All the ten essays have already appeared in print, and it is unnecessary to say anything further concerning them here, unless it be to add that among them are the remarkably fine essays on Prosper Mérimée and Raphael, and the not less deserving papers on Notre-Dame d'Amiens and Vézelay. We should not omit to add, however, that Mr. Shadwell has appended to his very brief preface a useful chronological list of Mr. Pater's published writings.

1. *Homeri Ilias*. Edited by WALTER LEAF, Litt.D. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895.
2. *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis*. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. Same Publishers. 1895.
3. *Horati Flacci Opera*. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. Same Publishers. 1895.

These three volumes are the first instalments of Messrs. Macmillan's 'Parnassus Library of Greek and Latin Texts.' They are an admirable beginning. A similar series has long been wanting to take the place of the German editions, to the use of which scholars have long been condemned, and the accuracy of the texts, together with the clear and excellent type in which they are printed, and the handy size of the volumes, ought to ensure for this new English series a very large amount of favour. It is evidently intended for scholars, and for those who prefer to read the text of classical authors without the encumbrance of notes. Here and there in the second and third volumes a few notes are given. They are such, however, as will be acceptable, inasmuch as they contain the principal variations from the text adopted. In the first volume Mr. Leaf has introduced an innovation in the printing of the *Iliad*. On his pages the iota subscript no longer appears. For the excellent reason he gives he has restored it to its ancient place by printing it as the second constituent of the diphthong. In the printing of the volume, it should be added, an entirely new fount has been used. It seems a little strange at first sight, but as the eye grows accustomed to it, its advantages over the traditional thin faced type become apparent. Mr. Leaf's text differs somewhat from the one he formerly printed, chiefly owing to a freer use of the Vienna L MS. Mr. Page's two volumes, besides containing the texts and the principal various readings, are furnished with excellent prefaces for the most part biographical.

*The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*. With Introduction and Notes. Edited by THOMAS HUTCHINSON, M.A. London: Henry Frowde. 1895.

Notwithstanding the great variety of editions of Wordsworth, some of them, as for instance, Mr. Morley's, of excellent quality, we have here another from the Clarendon Press which promises to be much the most popular. It is issued in three forms: a crown octavo edition on ordinary paper, another of the same size printed upon the now well-known Oxford India paper, and a miniature edition printed on the same paper in five diminutive volumes enclosed in a case. The first of these is a marvel of cheapness. It consists of over a thousand pages printed in a very clear and legible type. The type of the other editions is the same. As for the editing Mr. Hutchinson seems to have executed his task with the most exemplary care. The poems are printed in the order adopted by Wordsworth himself. Their printing in their chronological order may be preferable, but, as Mr. Hutchinson points out, this is scarcely possible, as so little is known as to the order in which many of them were written. At the foot of the pages Mr. Hutchinson has given a number of different readings, and here and there he has ventured, but not without good reason, to alter a reading adopted by the poet in his final editions. At the end of the volume we have Wordsworth's notes, prefaces and essays, and an index to the first lines, while at the beginning we have a very full and useful chronological table of Wordsworth's life.



*Old-World Japan: Legends of the Land of the Gods.* Re-told by FRANK RINDER. Illustrations by T. H. Robinson. London: George Allen. 1895.

The stores of Japanese folk-lore seem to be as inexhaustible as they are varied and attractive. Some of the stories which Mr. Rinder has here gleaned from them and re-told in English are taken from the accounts of the god-period contained in the *Kojiki* and the *Nihongi* or 'Records of Ancient Matters,' compiled in the eighth century of the Christian era, and may be taken as representing, as far as they go, the ancient mythology of the Japanese. The rest belong to a later period, and while reflecting in a measure the thought and civilisation of Japan, bear indications of the influence of China. The stories, which have been selected with tact, are entertaining and instructive, and are told with admirable skill. Mr. Rinder has acted wisely in abbreviating the many-syllabled Japanese names. As for the illustrations, it is sufficient to say that they are by Mr. T. H. Robinson, and that they are numerous. The volume is one to delight the hearts of the young, and will be found worth reading by the student of primitive romance.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*The Songs of the Holy Nativity* (Macmillan) by Thomas Dehany Bernard, M.A., is a devotional commentary on the opening section of the Gospel according to St. Luke ch. i., 5—ii., 41. The commentary is preceded by several chapters of an historical or biographical character dealing with the sources of the songs and the channels through which they passed to the Evangelist, with the families in which the songs originated and the annunciation. The commentary itself is instructive and suggestive, and will be found excellent reading at other times as well as during Advent.

*Pascal and other Sermons* (Macmillan) is a further instalment of lectures and sermons by the late Dean Church. Besides the admirable lecture on Pascal's *Pensées* we have the two lectures on Bishop Butler and Bishop Andrewes. These alone are sufficient to give weight and value to the volume. Like the lectures some of the sermons which follow them have already seen the light in other volumes, though some of them are here published for the first time.

In *The Permanent Message of the Exodus* (Hödder & Stoughton) the Rev. Dr. Smith of Edinburgh seeks to bring out the chief religious lessons taught by the book of Exodus, more especially in connection with the life of Moses as there recorded. The various critical questions which have agitated and are still agitating the minds of scholars are passed by. Dr. Smith's aim is popular instruction. The lessons are frequently illustrated by modern instances and are clearly put.

*Lancelot Andrewes and his Private Devotions* (Oliphant, Anderson) by Alexander Whyte, contains a biography of the famous Bishop, an interpretation of his devotions, with certain bibliographical notes concerning them and a transcript or translation of the prayers. Free use has been made in the latter of the translations made by Newman and Neale; but where possible Dr. White has made use of the language of the Authorised Version. The current Latin and Greek texts have been used along with Canon Medd's Laudian text.

Mr. Williamson's volume of sermons entitled *The Truth and the Witness* (Macmillan) has been suggested by a passage in Bishop Westcott's volume on the Gospel of St. John, in which he describes the object of that Gospel

to be to express the parallel development of faith and unbelief through the historical presence of Christ, and points out that in developing this plan, the Evangelist dwells on three pairs of ideas, viz., witness and truth, glory and light, judgment and life, and the aim of the sermons is to develop the first of these three pairs of ideas, in other words, to set forth the manifold witness of the Father and of the Son, of our Lord's works, of the Prophets, of the Scriptures, of the Disciples and of the Holy Spirit to our Lord's claim to be the Saviour of the World.

In *Missions and Mission Philanthropy* (Macmillan) Mr. John Goldie deals very freely and searchingly with one of the great social and religious problems of the day. 'For the amelioration, or improvement, in the conditions of the poor,' he says, 'we can no longer put any faith in those virtues that have been so long looked upon as the proper regeneration of mankind—Religion, Morality, Education.' 'Nor can we,' he adds, 'include in our philanthropy, what have been considered the leaven and essence of philanthropy—Ideality, Sentiment, Imagination, or what goes to form our higher conceptions of life.' The poor, he says, 'know all about these things, but do not find them useful in the battle of life.' And the problem is, he urges, how to obtain their sympathy and co-operation. This, he thinks, can be obtained only when they have perfectly satisfied themselves of the advantages to them personally of the plan to be adopted. Mr. Goldie has evidently had large experience of the poor and of different attempts made to improve their condition. Some of his opinions are not a little startling, and here and there the reader may find himself far from agreeing with him; yet there can be no doubt that much that he has to say is sound and healthy, and deserving of very serious consideration in philanthropic and other circles.

An excellent book for those who wish to begin the study of the text Testament Greek and have no acquaintance with the language is Mr. John H. Huddilston's *Essentials of New Testament Greek* (Macmillan). Everything is so admirably put and arranged that no beginners can desire a better or find an easier access to the language. All that he needs with the little manual in his hands is application and a fair amount of intelligence.

In Miss May Sinclair Professor R. Sohm has found a very capable translator for his *Outlines of Church History* (Macmillan). The work itself was worth translating. In Germany it has passed through numerous editions, and the translation made by Miss Sinclair will meet, we should say, with a warm welcome both among students of Church history and by those who wish to form a general conception of the different phases through which that history has passed. 'Outlines' is rather an inadequate title for the volume, as it contains much more than is covered by that term and is instinct throughout with life and thought, and is in fact the work of a master in the art of condensation.

The lectures contained in the late Dr. Hort's *Six Lectures on the Anti-Nicene Fathers* (Macmillan) were delivered by the author to the Clergy Training School at Cambridge in the Lent Term of 1890, and have been prepared for publication by his son. The lectures are brief but weighty, and besides containing biographical sketches of the Fathers dealt with, aim at characterising their work and writings and describing their position and influence in the Christian Church. Like everything else from the writer's pen they will well repay perusal.

*Historical Essays* (Macmillan), by the late Bishop Lightfoot, contains a number of lectures written and delivered by their author previous to his appointment to the See of Durham. First of all we have three lectures on Christian life in the second and third centuries, delivered in St. Paul's,

London, in 1872. These are followed by a lecture on the comparative progress of ancient and foreign missions. The lectures which come next, on England during the latter half of the thirteenth century, of which there are two, were delivered before the Philosophical Institution in Edinburgh in February, 1874. The lecture on Donne, the Poet-Preacher, formed one of a course delivered in St. James's Church, Westminster, in 1877, on 'The Classic Preachers of the English Church.' To the above have been added a fragment on the Chapel of St. Peter and the Manor-House of Auckland, and an unfinished essay on Auckland Castle. The two last pieces belong, of course, to a later period in the Bishop's life than the lectures. The lectures delivered in St. Paul's and at Edinburgh show the master hand, more especially the former, and will be read with much interest. The volume forms a very acceptable addition to the 'Eversley Series.'

The Rev. Dr. Hatherly in his *Office of the Credence and the Divine Liturgy* (the Church Printing Company), has brought together and printed in parallel columns four English versions of Office of the Credence and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. They are those of Coval (1722), Dr. King (1772), Dr. Neale (1859), and by an anonymous translator whose version was published in 1866. These different versions, besides carefully printing them, Dr. Hatherly has very minutely annotated. Slight as the work appears, it has evidently involved a considerable amount of labour and will doubtless prove extremely useful to those for whom it is intended.

Messrs Macmillan have issued in its complete form, under the title *A Lecture on the Study of History*, the address delivered by Lord Acton when entering upon his duties as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge last June. Though reported at considerable length at the time in the newspapers, readers will be glad to renew their acquaintance with it in its present form. It is a remarkable piece of condensed writing and deserves to be read and re-read, as containing in a small compass what may be called a whole philosophy of history.

*The Parish of Longforgan* (Oliphant, Anderson), by the Rev. Adam Philip, M.A. gives an extremely interesting and instructive account of the Parish of Longforgan situated partly in the Carse of Gowrie and partly on the slopes reaching up to the Sidlaws. Mr. Philip takes in most things of interest in connection with the Parish, and is as much at home in dealing with its antiquities as with its history. Here and there he strays into the adjoining parishes noting their ecclesiastical and other remains, and their connection with Longforgan. The book is an excellent sample of what might be done for other Parishes in Scotland.

In *Curious Episodes in Scottish History* (Alex. Gardner) Mr. R. Scott Fittis has chosen for restatement some of the better known incidents in the history of Scotland. Among them are the attempt on the part of the company of Fife lairds to colonise Lewis in 1598, Queen Mary's imprisonment in Lochleven Castle, the doings of Rob Roy, and the fate of the ill-starred Master of Rollo. Mr. Fittis, however, does not confine himself to the narration of any one particular incident in connection with any of the places about which he writes, but imports into his chapters a large amount of information more or less remotely connected with their principal subjects. The two chapters on Serfdom in Scotland and Pilgrims of the Pack will have a touch of novelty for many.

Mr. Ross has issued his fifth volume of *Burnsiana* (Alex. Gardner). The contents are as usual extremely varied, and can scarcely fail to be as attractive as those of previous volumes. They consist of various speeches and lectures on Burns, notably one by Mr. Crockett, and a variety of odds

and ends gathered from many quarters, together with the usual price list of Burnsiana literature.

Quaint and not without considerable attractiveness in its outward appearance, the autumn number of *The Evergreen*, written by Mr. P. Geddes and his colleagues, and published by them at the Lawnmarket, Edinburgh, is full of life and spirit and refined feeling. There is no sign of decadence about, though it deals chiefly with the autumnal aspects of nature, society and life. The strongest paper in the number is from the hand of Mr. Geddes. Sir Noel Paton contributes a number of graceful verses, and Mr. W. Sharp, besides a poem or two, a translation of van Lerberghe's *Les Flaireurs*, a play which though suggestive is not in any way a subject for enthusiasm. Among other notable pieces are Miss Rinder's Breton legend entitled 'Amel and Penhor,' and Miss Macleod's 'Mary of the Gael.'

*In My City Garden* (Alex. Gardner) by George Umber may be commended as a series of genial essays written with a light hand and enlivened by many personal reminiscences sometimes touching and sometimes amusing. It is one of those books which it is a pleasure to read both because of the kindly spirit by which they are pervaded and because of the wise thoughts and reflections which are continually lighting up their pages. The author whoever he be, is apparently a physician and also a man of wide culture and large experience in human ways and human life. The city garden seems to be in Glasgow. The work, however, is thoroughly human and is not less instructive than entertaining.

*Les Grand Problemes*, by M. Adolphe François (Ch. Noblet, Paris), are great problems, but we cannot say that the treatment they receive here is at all worthy of them. The problems are four in number:—*La question des Bonheur ; Le Bien Social ; Le Beau ; La question de l'Ame*. M. François wishes to furnish a minute guide for his readers in their efforts to attain to happiness, and solve the puzzling perplexities of the life that now is and that which is to come. So far good. But take the following as samples merely of the guidance we receive: 'Bonheur' is 'un état de plaisir aussi constant qu'il est possible.' Its conditions are: 'le santé modéré, l'aisance, le mariage, la pair le travail, l'honneur, l'idéal, l'indépendance, la puissance, et la bienfaisance.' The means of attaining it are: 'l'hygiène, la manière de vivre, le metier, la femme.' Under the second of those items we are recommended to regale ourselves on fish, poultry, rabbits, and game; 'mais,' our author gravely adds, 'le grose bête ne parait pas avoir été faite pour être manger, sauf cet excellente porc, qui n'a vraiment pas d'autre raison d'être.' We are informed, too, 'il faut apporter la plus grande attention à la qualite du vin.' This kind of writing is apt to become very tiresome in this busy age.

#### REPRINTS.

The most notable reprint of the quarter which has reached us is that of the late Mr. J. R. Green's *History of the English People*. Messrs. Macmillan are including it in their handsome 'Eversley Series,' and have already issued the first and second volumes. The first brings the narrative down to the year 1216, while the second continues the story to the year 1400. The work, as is well known, differs in many respects from the *Short History*. In its present form it cannot fail to commend itself to a very wide circle of readers.

Another notable reprint of the quarter is *Vacation Rambles* (Macmillan) by the author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. The papers were for the most part contributed by Mr. Hughes to the *Spectator* over the signature Viator Vacuus, and go back for their beginning to the year 1862, while the last of them is dated 1895. They carry the reader over many parts of the Continent of Europe, as well as across the Atlantic to Canada and the United States. They are, to say the least, healthy and cheerful reading. The author is always in good spirits, has his eyes well about him, and is always on the lookout for everything having a human interest. The letters, for such the papers are, are written in that easy and attractive style which characterises all that Mr. Hughes has written, and with which English readers in every quarter of the globe are now well acquainted.

To the 'Mermaid Series' Mr. Fisher Unwin has added a volume of Selections from the Plays of George Chapman, which has been edited by Mr. W. L. Phelps. The plays chosen are 'All Fools,' 'Bussy D'Ambois,' 'The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois,' 'The Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of Byron,' and 'The Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron,'—a selection which may be commended as thoroughly representative. Mr. Phelps has added an introduction giving an account of Chapman and his work, and has supplied a sufficiency of notes.

Professor Shield Nicholson's *Treatise on Money and Essays on Monetary Problems* (A. & C. Black) has reached a third edition. The two essays on 'Living Capital' and 'Capital and Labour' have been omitted with the intentions of including them in another volume dealing with general and social economic problems. The treatise on money, however, has been enlarged by the addition of a second part having special reference to the effects of the production of the precious metals upon industry and trade. In this new part the author has a good deal to say in respect to the controversy at present going on in monetary circles as to whether the quantity theory of money can be reconciled with the great increase in the production of gold and with the unprecedented accumulation of gold in the Bank of England.

Mr. Tallach's *Penological and Preventive Principles* (Wertheimer, Lea, & Co.) appears in an enlarged edition. The new chapters treat of such topics as Sentences, Capital Punishment, Intemperance, Pauperism, Prostitution, and Social Crimes.

#### FICTION.

*The Sorrows of Satan* (Methuen) by M. Corelli is as powerful as a story as its title is at first sight fantastic. Miss Corelli's conception of Satan is to say the least curious. Philosophers may be able to say a good deal in favour of it, but theologians will without doubt have much to say against it. The plot, though nothing more than the development of the idea, is admirably worked out. Miss Corelli has much to say about the log-rolling reviewer; and perhaps we should not be far wrong if we say that one purpose of her book is to expose him. This she does in the most merciless way. The picture of the authoress who has not paid homage to him and whose books all the same sell is drawn with minute care and has many amusing turns. For daringness of conception and for excellence of literary workmanship the book has not had its equal for many a day.

The tales printed under the title of *The Sin-Eater* (Patrick Geddes) are all thoroughly Highland, and are told by their author, Mr. Flora Macdonald, with remarkable skill. Each of them opens up new aspects in the



life and thought and superstitions of the Highlanders of the West Coast. One of them is taken from the old legends, but the rest of them belong to the present day. As of especial merit may be mentioned the story which gives its name to the volume, 'The Ninth Wave,' and 'The Dannan-ron.' 'From Iona' and its explanation of 'The Gloom' should not be overlooked.

In *The Days of Auld Langsyne* (Hodder and Stoughton) Ian Maclaren reverts to the village of Drumtochty, and we revisit it and listen to his narration of the incidents which occurred in the lives of those of its inhabitants whom he singles out with unmixed pleasure. The book is in every way a great advance on its predecessor. Its tone is healthier and most robust, and gives evidence of much greater power.

The *Whaups of Durley* (Fisher Unwin), by Mr. W. C. Fraser, is a reprint of papers which have already seen the light in various publications. Together they contain a graphic account of boyhood in a Scottish village. There is an element of fun in them, and here and there a touch of the ridiculous, but what picture of a Scottish village would be true without them? Mr. Fraser knows the life he is depicting, and writes for the most part in good broad Scots, evidently knowing the meaning of his words and without the help of a dictionary.

---

#### ERRATA.

---

Page 132, line 23, for *de cori* read *pecori*.

Page 133, line 27, for *questum* read *quantum*.